Tiruppanandal Endowment Lectures —1951

SAIVA SIDDHĀNTA

BY

Thiru K. VAJRAVELU MUDALIAR, B. A., L. T.,
Head - Master, Pachaiappas' High School, Kancheepuram.

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY
ANNAMALAINAGAR

LECTURES ON SAIVA-SIDDHANTA

SAIVA-SIDDHANTA, THE ESSENCE OF THE VEDANTA

(Lecture delivered on 19—11—1951 at 2 p. m. in the Benares Hindu University with Dr. B. L. Atreya, M. A., B. Litt., Head of the department of Philosophy, B.H.U., in the chair)

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I understand that my predecessors in this lectureship have given a collective account or a summary of the work in question viz., Sivagnana Siddhiar, which might have conveyed a general idea of the Saiva-Siddhanta System. This year I wish to make a new approach. With the intention of making some of the First Principles of Saiva Siddhanta clear, I propose to deal with three topics, viz., Saiva Siddhanta, the essence of Vedanta, The Form of the Formless and Sri Panchakshara. Today I shall begin with the first of these three.

We, the inhabitants of Bharat, whether living in the North or in the South are common heirs of a great heritage, viz., the Vedas—the accumulated wisdom of ages. They are the records of the spiritual experience of great sages, saints and seers in their god-conscious state.

Now this heritage cannot be partitioned, nor need it be done. But while profiting by it, we do so in different degrees in as much as we follow different guides in distinguishing the important from the unimportant, and in arriving at a correct understanding of the spirit of the Vedas. The guides are our Acharyas, who have given us, the erring mortals,

useful hints so that we may re-discover Truth and fulfil our eternal aspiration.

Saiva-Siddhanta is, of course, a system of philosophy found peculiarly located in the South of our sub-continent, influencing the daily-life, literature, culture and civilization of the Tamilians. For one who has a deep insight into the Tamil Language and Literature, it will seem to be the very spirit of the Tamil language, which has a history going back to many thousands of years. (1) But still, the system may be considered to be a specific interpretation of the highest findings of the Vedanta, the Upanishads. It shall be my endeavour, in the course of this as well as the other two lectures that are to be delivered tomorrow and day after to-morrow, to show, to the best of my ability, how Saiva Siddhanta is an exposition of Vedanta, the concluding portion of the Vedas.

The great saintly scholars who, in their infinite mercy, helped us, the people of the South, know the *Paramarthas* or the Synthesis of Truth, precisely and concisely, easily and in clear terms, through our mother-tongue, do not say that the system they are expounding is something provincial or *parochial*, limited to the four corners of the Tamil land. They have said in clear terms that the system they expounded is Vedanta, or to put it more correctly, the *essence of Vedanta*.

Sri Umapathi Sivacharya commences his work named *Sivaprakasam* by saying, "We begin to expound *Saiva-Siddhanta, the essence of Vedanta* (2)", and, while concluding the work, says, "We have analysed the *paramarthas* given by *Vedasiras* (3)".

I shall first of all go to the very heart of the question : We all agree that the highest teaching of the Vedas or the

Vedanta is embodied in the four great expressions or *Mahavakyas* taken from the Four Vedas. They are :—

i. 'Prajnanam Brahma' (Intelligence is Brahman) of the Aitreya Upanishat of the Rig Veda,

ii. 'Aham Brahmasmi' (I am Brahman) of the Brahadaranyaka of the Yajur Veda,

iii. 'Tat tvam asi' (that thou art) of the Chandogya of the Sama Veda,

iv. 'Ayam Atma Brahma' (This self is Brahman) of the Atharva Veda.

These utterances indicate not only the end that the individual self is to attain but also the means to that end. They express the inexpressible if we may say so. For the present, I leave the first, and consider the remaining three expressions. Each of these three indicates two principles and predicates a relation between them. For example in the great utterance, 'Aham Brahmasmi' (I am Brahman), *Brahman* is one principle-the Supreme Being behind the physical life of the world, usually established ontologically in our systems of philosophy ; '*Aham*' is another principle-the Individual self behind the mental life of the living being-usually established by a process of elimination applied to psychological introspection. The word 'asmi' predicates a relationship between them. This relation is taken to be one of identity by Sri Sankaracharya, and otherwise by others.

But in the Saiva Siddanta system of philosophy, this relation is taken to be that indicated by the word '*Advaitam*' which occurs in Chandogya.

The Upanishadic text is : Sadeva Sōmyedam agra āsid – Ekamevādvitiyam

(My dear boy, *Sat* which is one only existed in the beginning in *advaita* relation)

This is based on the following text that occurs in the Yajur Veda, which is also repeated in Svetasvatara :
Ekōhi Rudrō nadvitiya tastuh.

(Rudra, who is one, was in *advaita* relation)

In these cases, the word Advaita is interpreted by different schools of thought in different ways : The prefix 'Na' is used to convey six different senses in Sanskrit. Of these, Sri Sankara and Sri Ramanuja attribute the sense of absence (Abhava) to the prefix and take the word *Advaita* to mean one or unity, for the absense or abhava of two is in unity, not in the other numbers, two, three etc. But still in giving the *Tatparya* (the intention behind the word) they differ. Sri Sankara takes the text to mean that the ultimate reality is one. He further reinforces his monistic interpretation by qualifying his meaning of *Advaita* with the word *Kevala* and says that *parabrahman is one only.* It cannot bear any implication of duality-either in itself or by the presence of any other entity of the same or of different category, i.e,, there cannot be Vijatiya, Sajatiya or Svahata bedha. It is mere being, mere intelligence (Chinmatra) ; it cannot be predicated. Thus according to him, of the three empirical principles viz., Anatma, Individual self and the Supreme Being, there cannot be any anatma apart from the Par-brahman, for if there be any, there comes in Vijatiya bedha; there cannot be any individual self apart from the Para-brahman, for if there be, there comes in Sajathiya bedha ; nor can there be any kind of difference in the parabrahman itself even in the conception such as will arise in attributing qualities or in conceiving it as a whole made of parts, for, if so conceived, there comes in Svahata bedha. Now it is clear that even after taking the word *Advaitam* to mean *one*, it does not fit in the scheme of Sankara's theory unless the word is further qualified by the adjunct *kevala.*

Sri Ramanuja construes the text to mean *the unity of God-Head.* Hence, according to him, the text does not preclude the admission of the reality of the anatma and the individual selves, for these are not independent entities but are related to the Supreme Being and the Supreme Being Himself has glorified attributes. So the text, according to him, must be taken to mean that para Brahman, qualified with the attributes etc. that are related to it, is one.

Madva gives the sense of opposition or contrariety (Virodha) to the prefix 'Na' in advaita and takes it to mean one, which is the opposite of two. According to him also the text means, 'Parabrahman is one' —But since that *one* is the opposite of *two*, the word advaitam does not deny the existence of an entity that is the opposite of parabrahman. Hence, the word advaitam itself conveys the meaning of Dvaitam (two) to him.

From the above it will be clear that all the three acharyas take the word 'Advaitam' to mean 'one', but, to suit their own favourite theories and to fit it in their respective schemes of thought, they modify the word 'advaitam' with the adjuncts *Kevala*, *Visishta*, and *Virodha* respectively. So their theories or interpretations are respectively called Kevaladvaitam, Visishtadvaitam and Bedhavadam. Of these three, the conclusion arrived at by Sri Ramanuja alone is, in the opinion of the Saiva-Siddhantins, consistent with the spirit of the Upanishads. But still the correct meaning of the word 'advaitam' is not one or unity as taken by him. For if it means one, then it is only a repetition of the word 'Ekam' that precedes. Moreover, if the idea of oneness or unity is the intention, the word 'Ekam' itself is apt because of its clarity; the term *'advaita'* which needs reflective thinking for its interpretation need not have been used. Also the idea of unity does not aid the interpretation of the great

Expressions (Mahavakyas) and thus the term 'advaitam' is rendered useless.[4]

Now the interpretation of the Siddhanta Saivites may be given as follows :—When one listens to the great expressions 'Tat Tvam Asi' etc., which mean 'That thou art,' 'That I am' and 'That this is' in the three persons, one is led to argue thus : 'That' is an entity; 'thou' is another entity. How can one entity be another entity ? In this context, the relation between the two entities by which *one entity* is *another* is expressed by the term 'advaita'. The term 'advaita' means ananya, union or inseparableness.[5] The prefix 'Na' expresses the sense of Sāmya or Sādrisya as in the word Abrahmana or Anashwa or Aneka. A thing that is one properly speaking may differ in itself either as whole and part or as attribute and attributed and thus be conceived as two: the relationship that causes this conception of one thing as two is called Tādātmya. In the same way, two entities may be so united as to be conceived as one in their togetherness ; for example, while one is in the act of seeing, the action on the part of the optic nerve and that of the mind behind it are inseparable. This relationship of two things acting as one is called *advaita.*

It must be noted that this relation is expressed in Mundaka by the word *Sāmya* itself :—

The following is the text :— Tadā vidwān punya pāpē vidhūya niranjanah paramam sāmyam upaiti

(One who knows parabrhaman gets rid of good and evil, becomes cleansed of the impurity, and attains *parama sāmya* with the Supreme)

In Tamil scriptures, the relation between the individual self and the Supreme Being is expressed by the term 'உடனுதல்', togetherness. This term occurs in one of the sacred hymns sung by the Infant Saint Tirujnana Sambandhar*[1] (7th Century A. C.) and his utterance is quoted verbatim and made use of in interpreting the great expressions-Mahavakyas-in Thiru Kalitrupadiyar*[1], a work on Saiva-Siddhanta philosophy more ancient than Sivajnana Bodham of Meykandar. So for as I can see, it is Sri Meykandar, the infant seer, who flourished in the early 13th Century A, C. that has pointed out very aptly that the term *advaita* of the Upanishads conveys the same sense and meaning as the Tamil term 'உடனுதல்' used by Tirujnana Sambandar and this was accepted and followed up by the philosopher Saint Arul Nandi Sivacharya and others in the holy line of preceptors.[2*]

It is because of this fact that Saint Tayumanavar praises Sri Meykandar thus :—

> "Oh ! for the day when I can attain the feet of the Lord that found the truth of Advaita, the pure, which could not be found by those that comprehended the untruth"(3)

---

*1 ஈருய் முதலொன்ருய் ....
... ... எட்டுத் திசைதாஞய்
வெருயுடனுனிடம் வீழிம்மிழலேயே —திருஞா. 1-11-2.

1* ஈருகி அங்கே முதலொன்ருய் ஈங்கிரண்டாய்
மாருத எண்வகையாய் மற்றிவற்றின்—வேருய்
உடனு யிருக்கும் உருவுடமை என்றும்
கடனு யிருக்கின்ருன் காண். —களிறு-86.

2* *Cf.* "அவையே தானேயாய்"—2nd Sutra-of St. Meykandar with "உலகெலாமாகி வேருய் உடனுமாய்" of St. Arulnandi Sivacharya, the latter being the paraphrase of the former. Note that Meykandar's expression is moulded after the pattern of the Mahavakyas, whereas Arulnandi's is a repetition of Thirugnanasambandar's hymn.

(3) பொய்கண்டார் காணுப் புனிதமெனும் அத்துவித
மெய்கண்ட நாதனருள் மேவுநாள் எந்நாளோ !

Saint Tayumanavar himself uses the word advaita in another place in the sense in which Sri Meykandar interpreted it :

> "Oh ! for the day when I shall be in advaita relation with the Brahman which is pure intelligence, even as I was in advaita relation with ā*nava*, the evil principle" (1)

Now it behoves me to show that this interpretation of the word *advaita* is in keeping with the spirit of the Upanishads. The ultimate end or goal of the individual self is, according to the Śaiva Siddhāntins, a state of endless bliss. In that state the individual self experiences the Supreme Being, which is Bliss. This blissful state is termed Bhuma by the Upanishads. For Sri Sankara the ultimate end is not one of experience; it is mere realization. The individual self realises that it is Chinmātra parabrahman, the ultimate reality. According to him, the individual self cannot be said to enjoy or experience bliss. So men of his persuasion go to the extent of taking the word 'ānanda' to mean not bliss or sukham but mere perfection. Now let us consider the following Upanishadic texts :

i. Rasam labdhvā nandī bhavati

(The individual self) obtains bliss and becomes *anandee*

ii. Eshahyēva ānandi bhavati

He certainly causes bliss (to the self)

iii. Yō vai bhūma tat sukham

(What is Bhūma (infinity), that is endless bliss)

iv. Yatra nānyat paśyati nānyat śruṇōti nānyat vijānāti sa bhūma.

(Where the self does not see any other thing, does not hear any other thing, does not cognize any other thing, that is Bhuma)

---

(1) ஆணவத்தோ டத்துவிதம் ஆனபடி மெய்ஞ்ஞானத் தாணுவினோ டத்துவிதம் சாருநாள் எந்நாளோ !

It is clear from these texts that in the highest state of spiritual attainment there is endless bliss, that the bliss is caused by the Supreme Being, that that is experienced by the individual self, that the bliss which is characteristic of the Supreme Being is called Bhuma, and that when the individual self experiences the bliss it identifies itself with the bliss and does not cognize or experience any other object, i. e., the world is not cognized by the self in the blissful state of *Bhuma.*

Now, I shall quote a verse from 'Unmaivilakkam', one of the fourteen authoritative works in Tamil on Saiva Siddhanta :

'முத்திதனில் மூன்று முதலும் மொழியக்கேள்
சுத்தஅனு போகத்தைத் துய்த்தலணு—மெத்தவே
இன்பங் கொடுத்தலிறை இத்தைவிளை வித்தல்மலம்
அன்புடனே கண்டுகொளப் பா'

O My son, hear how the three eternal entities are in the state of Release. The individual self enjoys Supreme Bliss the pure. The Supreme Being imparts Bliss (to the self) and *Mala* effects this (indirectly by screening the world from the self).

A comparison of this verse with the Upanishadic texts quoted above will reveal how the former is only a faithful epitome of the latter. The view that the word 'Ananda' should be taken to mean infinite bliss, not mere perfection, is strengthened by the use of the synonym *Sukham* in the same context. Saint Manikkavachakar says, "I have obtained endless bliss" (அந்தமொன்றில்லா ஆனந்தம் பெற்றேன்).

Now to the logical foundation of the approach made by the Saiva-Siddhanta towards the solution of the central problem of the Vedanta, viz , how to compromise the monistic

nature of the spiritual experience, where the world is totally absent, with the actual worldly experince that is so real simultaneously to all except those that are in *Samadhi* or *Nishtha* :

Philosophy, in the sense in which the term is understood in India, does not exclude the consideration of the mystic exprience. In fact, it is a sincere attempt at correct interpretation of the mystic experience of the saints and sages. At the same time, it takes into consideration the logical needs of the system of thought and the consistency among the various conclusions arrived at. So Meykandar, who has placed the Saiva-Siddhanta System of thought on sound logical foundations, gives as the guiding principle that one should have a correct understanding of one's own self, before one can venture to assert anything with regard to the Supreme Being. He says,

" தம்மை உணர்ந்து தமையுடைய தன்னுணர்வார்
எம்மை உடைமை எமையிகழார்;—தம்மை
உணரார் உணரார் ; உடங்கியைந்து தம்மிற்
புணராமை கேளாம் புறன் " 6

"Those that realize their own true nature first and then understand the nature of the Supreme (by Spiritual experience) of which the individual selves are the eternal servants, are one with the Supreme. So they have us as their servant and will not find fault with our system. Those that do not understand themselves cannot understand the nature of the Divine ; as these do not agree among themselves and unite, their abuse we heed not ".

The individual self is the measure of all. It is the subject of experience, worldly or spiritual, and it is the self that interprets the experiences, evaluates them, leaves one and pursues the other. So emphasis is to be laid on the individual

self. But, curiously enough for a wordly man, the world alone seems to be real ; he doubts whether after all there can be anything like the self behind the mental life of the organism or whether there can be anything like God or Supreme Being behind the physical life of the phenomenal world. So, too, a perfected soul that has reached the zenith of the spiritual experience feels that there is only the Supreme, not any other thing.

Now what is the explanation for this state of affairs ? The explanation is to be sought in the nature of the individual self. It must be noted that the monistic spiritual experience is obtained by the same self that has been till then experiencing the multicoloured nature. Also, even the perfected self, while descending to the worldly experience, feels the existence of the world with all its laws. So neither of these two experiences can be disposed of by saying that it is illusion or unreal.

If from the stand point of spiritual experience an idealist says that the world is an illusion, the materialist, from the stand point of worldly experience, can say, with at least equal emphasis, that what is spoken of as Parabrahman is a mental fantasy. So the real solution is to hold that both the experiences are true and that while the self experiences the world, it is not cognizant of the Supreme and while it experiences the Supreme it is not cognizant of the world*. Further, when the self experiences anything it identifies itself with the object of experience and does not feel itself as a distinct entity apart from it. In other words, experience is always both cognition of and life in the object experienced.

---

* This view is supported by the Upanishadic text which has already been quoted, viz., " yatra nānyat Pasyati etc. "

The following text from Sarvajnanottara is worth considering in this context : which brieflly gives the nature of the individual self :— Sarvē dharmātman asnanti, yadēva parikalpayēt - tat tat bhavayasandēhāt sadā tat bhāva bhavitah.

(The individual self has the characteristics of all things; for, whatever he determines (cognizes) he becomes of the same nature of the thing so determined, and so he always has his being identified with the things contacted)

It is this characteristic of the individual self that is at the root of both wordly and spiritual experiences.

The meaning of the word, Anubhava (experience) is, in Saiva-Siddhanta, cognitional ingress, both cognition of and life in the object of experience and this is peculiar to the intellect of the individual self (Ātma Chaitanya). This cannot be attributed either to *anātma* that is insentient, or to the Supreme Being whose intelligence cognizes all things at all times without ingress.

An illustration may be given to distinguish between mere cognition and experience or Anubhava. Suppose one of you has brought with him his child. The child strays away from the lecture hall and after sometime a cry exactly like that of the child is heard. Now the person who brought the child feels uneasy, gets himself worried. Suppose, just then, it is reported to him that it is not his child that cries; immediately he feels relief. Now let us note the difference in the two cases : In the first case, the person identifies himself with the child and so he is affected. This is experience or cognitional ingress. In the other case, it is one of mere cognition. So it will be clear from this illustration that in experience there is cognition of and identification with the object experienced for the time being; and the subject of

experience, the individual self, during experience, is oblivious to all other objects and to itself.

If I may take you deep into the matter, let me explain how the Saivasiddhanta System conceives of experience: Suppose, while I am lecturing to you, I happen to see through the doorway a person passing by. I catch a glimpse of the person, and an impression of the object is formed in my mind. This first impression is called sense perception and it is of the form, "There appears something". This is called *nirvikalpa prathyaksha*, for the cognition is with respect to the existence of the object alone without any reference to its attributes. Then a chain of psychological processes starts. The first is in the form of enquiry, viz., what shall it be ? Then there arise in the mind several suggestions tinged with an element of doubt. Thirdly, there comes into play the will to determine or to form the judgment. Finally there is the judgment of the form, "This is so and so". This final judgment is called Savikalpa pratyaksha or *Mānasa pratyaksha*. Now, it should be remembered that in Indian Systems of philosophy wherever there is a manifestation of self's power to know or to do, it is taken as an axiomatic truth that there is an instrument or organ. For example, we see with the eyes, hear with the ears, smell with the nose, taste with the tongue, and so on. So extending this idea of ours to the four mental processes mentioned above, the processes are attributed respectively to four internal organs named *chitta, manas, ahankar* and *buddhi* respectively. Thus, when *buddhi* after the due processes determine, an object to be of such and such nature, it becomes modified into Satwa, Rajasa or Tamasa form according as the one or the other of these three gunas has been predominent in the object perceived. At this stage, *this buddhi is experienced as Sukha, Dukha or Moha according as it is modified into Satwa, Rajasa or*

Tamasa form and the individual self feels that it experiences pleasure, pain or stupor as the case may be. This experience is called *Svavedana pratyaksha.*

It may be noted here that worldly pleasure as conceived by the Saiva-Siddhantins is only the reflection or the manifestation on the self of the satwaguna of Mulaprakriti which is a distinct entity other than the self ; and experience of worldly pleasures is the self's cognition of it with ingress. So also, the Supreme Bliss is the reflection or manifestation on the self of the Bliss of the Supreme Being which is a distinct entity other than the self ; and the spiritual experience is the self's cognitional ingress in it.[8]

Thus the system of Saiva-Siddhanta gives a consistent interpretation or explanation of both the worldly and the spiritual experience and harmonises them. Saint Meikandar gives the essence of the nature of the individual self in a short pithy saying, "இருதிறன் அறிவுளது இரண்டலா ஆன்மா"[9] (The self which is neither the one nor the other of the two entities, Sat and Asat (viz., the parabrahman which is unchangeable and changeless, and the changing world), has the cognitional ingress of both. The Tamil phrase 'இருதிறனறிவு' is capable of expansion in three *cases* (grammatical) simultaneously, and it means that the self has cognitional ingress *of. with* and *in* both Sat and Asat ; [10] i. e., while it cognizes Sat, it does so with the aid of Sat and has its being in Sat ; and while it cognizes Asat, it does so with the aid of Asat and has its being in Asat. Let me try to explain it further :- The essence of the self or atma may be taken to be, as the term itself indicates, self-consciousness. But this consciousness is also directed towards external objects and when so directed it is called *Atma Chit Sakti* the *conciousness-force of the self*. Thus when we consider the behaviour of the self as we know it by psychological introspection, we have the dual conception of it viz., the self and its

consciousness-force. But since in reality the principle is one, so far as one individual self is concerned, the relationship between the self and its consciousness-force is one of *Tādātmya* (sameness of nature). Now, this consciousness-force always requires a *lighter* or *Vyanjaka* for its manifestation. For example, in the act of seeing, the self's consciousness-force requires the aid of the optic nerve besides the psychic equipment which is analysed into Antahkaranas etc., So while cognising Asat (i.e., the changing world) the self does so through the organism with all its psychic equipment in it; and when it objectifies a particular thing, the self identifies itself with the lighter or Vyanjaka with which or through which it objectifies the thing and so has its being in it. For example, when we have sense perception (Nirvikalpa Pratyaksha) we identify ourselves with the senses; when we have the Savikalpa pratyaksha, we identify ourselves with the internal organs called antahkaranas and so on. And these lighters are also of the same nature as of the objects i. e., they are also Asat. Thus while we have cognitional ingress in asat (the changing world), we do so with asat as medium, and while doing so we identify ourselves with asat and have our being in it. Now this identification of the self with asat, which is a distinct entity other than the self, can be described by the word *advaita*, which word has been shown to mean ananya or union.

By the by, I must tell you that the terms *sat* and *asat* that are used in the Upanishads are understood by the Saiva Siddhantins not as exclusive terms but as relative. Sat means a reality that is changeless in form or state; and asat is a reality that is subject to change; the word asat is also used to indicate things which are spoken of but cannot be experienced or congnised.

Now to the counterpart of the idea on hand: Even as the individual self is conceived as being dual in its nature, so also we have to conceive the Divine or the Supreme as being dual in its nature. When we consider the Supreme or paramatman by itself as being self-luminous, we call it Sivam, but when we consider it in its relation with the cosmos, we call it Siva Shakti. [11] These two aspects of the supreme may be compared to the sun and its light respectively. I shall reserve further explanation of the matter to a future lecture. But here I may mention that the Śruti, Etasmin Khalvaksharē gārgyākāśa ōtascha Prōtasha. (Brihat Aranyaka) (In this Akshara Brahman Akash is interwoven) is taken to lend support to this view. Here the term *Akasha* also the term *parame vyoman* of the Rig Veda is taken to be a *paryāya* (synonym) for Śiva Śhakti. It does not denote 'avidya' as Sankara has taken. It is Chidambaram, the consciousness-force of the Supreme, which is both its quality and swarupa (nature). The following text from the Kālottara Āgama is taken to be the interpretation of the Upanishadic text quoted above:

"Shiva-Śakti is Guna ; Śiva is Guni, which is the Aśrya of that Guna." Here again the relation between Siva and His Shakti, or the Paramatman and His Consciousness-Force is to be understood as one of Tādatmya and the relation between the Paramatman and His creation as one of advaita. Now if the individual self is to experience the Supreme, it can do so only through His Shakti, which is also called His Grace. When we see the sun, we do not seek the help of any lamp, but we see it with its rays ; so also the self's consciousness-force need not and should not seek the aid of asat to see and experience the Supreme. The lighter or vyanjaka for the self's consciousness-force in the case where the self experiences the Supreme is the Supreme's Consciousness-force itself, not any other thing ; and, while so

experiencing, the self identifies itself with the Supreme and has its being in it. Thus the self while cognizing (with ingress) Sat, does so with Sat as lighter and has its being in it.

Now it must be clear why so long as we are of the world we do not see either ourselves or the Supreme, the self of ourselves ; and why for a man who has the highest spiritual experience, the world seems to be non-existent and he himself feels that he is one with the Para-Brahman.

Since in the above discussion it is said that the individual self has the cognition of both Sat and Asat, it follows that all that are called Sat or Asat are prameya; the self that cognizes them is *pramata*, the self's consciousness-force is pramana, and the act of cognition is *pramiti*. Since it is said that the self cognises with both, it follows that in the case of knowledge of the external world, pratyaksha, Anumana and Agama are the lighters or vyanjakas and that in the case of experience of the Supreme the Consciousness-Force of the Supreme, His Chit-Shakti or His Grace, which is ever with the self in inseparable relation as the primary support, is the lighter or vyanjaka.[12] The knowledge that is obtained with pratyaksha, anumana and agama as lighters is called *pasajnana*; and the knowledge obtained with Siva-Shakti or Grace as the lighter is called Sivajnana. This Sivajnana will light upon a person, who with the guidance of a True Guru, discriminates himself from all things that are Asat, thus detaches himself from them and performs ananya bhavana with the Supreme as indicated by the Great expressions or Mahavakyas[13] According to the spiritual tradition of the Saiva-Adinams, the Mahavakya that refers to the individual self in the third person is the formula for the Guru to think that the disciple is one with the Para Brahman and hence its form is Prasada Bhavana

rupa ; the one that refers to the self in the second person is that which is imparted to the disciple; hence it is Upadesarupa; the third is the form in which the disciple is to perform abhyasa; it is Abhyasa rupa. These are Vedanta Mahavakyas. For these, the forms 'Sivoyamasti'; 'Sivatvamasi' and 'Sivohamasmi' are substituted in preference ! for the word 'Sivam' indicates the Supreme Bliss which is the essence of the Supreme, and in the form 'Aham Brahmasmi' the thought of Aham, or the egoistic thought, is predominent and so the form 'Sivohamasmi.' which puts Siva first and makes Aham follow it, is preferred. These latter forms are called Siddhanta Mahavakyas.

Incidentally, it may also be noted that in the Saiva-Siddhanta System, the self's consciousness-force or atma chitshakti is pramana. whereas in the Nyaya-viseshika systems and others pratyaksha, anumana and agama that are only vyanjakas are mentioned to be pramanas. The reason for this deviation is that what is pramana should not become prameya ; otherwise, when the original pramana becomes prameya, one has to go in search for another pramana for that prameya. [1] Atma-chitshaki can never be prameya, whereas pratyaksha (i.e., sense organs and manas), anumana (the antecedent in the case of an inference) and authoritative sayings are all prameya. So what is pramana in Saiva-Siddhanta is the pramana of the pramanas in the other systems. [2] If pratyaksha etc. of the other systems are referred to as pramanas in Saiva-Siddhanta works, it is only by courtesy usage, (Upachara prayoga); i. e., they are called pramanas only by secondary application of the term.

1. Vide Sivagra Yogikal commentary on the first stanza of *Alavai Iyal* of Sivagnana Siddhiyar.

2. "புகல் அளவைக்கு அளவாகி" — சிவப்பிரகாசம் பாயிரம், 7.; "இனி, தார்க்கிகர் முதலியோர் காட்சி முதலிய பிரயிதிக்குப் பொறி முதலியனவே பிரமாணமென்பர். பிரமாணம் பிரமேயப் பொருளாதல் செல்லாமையிற் பொறி முதலாயினவும் ஏனையபோலப்

Now I may sum up the conclusions of this lecture :—

The highest teaching of the Upanishads is contained in the four great expressions known as Mahavakyas. While all agree as to the truth of this finding, yet they differ in their interpretation. Here Saiva Siddhanta takes a practical standpoint and gives a specific interpretation to them. It applies strict logical methods derived from the keen observation of life here and now.

According to Saiva-Siddhanta, change does not and cannot imply non-existence. Entities subject to changes cannot be easily disposed of by saying that they are mere appearances, and so unreal, meriting no serious attention. Worldly experience is as real as the highest spiritual experience, only the former is subject to fluctuation and change, whereas the latter is changeless and endless ; the former is the means, whereas the latter is the end. Hence spiritual experience can and must be interpreted or understood in the light of wordly experience. Otherwise, philosophy loses its value as a guide to the mankind in the attainment of its final destination or in the fulfilment of its aspirations.

The guiding principle in systematizing and interpreting spiritual experiences or truths should be that the system or the interpretation must be based on the foundation of a correct understanding of the individual self, for it is the subject of all experiences, the centre round which all experiences revolve ; and it must therefore be the polar star that should guide us in our movements.

பிரமேயமாய் அளந்தறியப்படும் பொருளேயாமாகலின், அவற்றைப் பிரமாணமென்றல் பொருந்தாது ; மற்றுச் சிவஞானம் உணர்த்த உணர்வதாகிய ஆன்ம சிற்சத்தியே அவர் பிரமாணமெனப் புகலும் இந்திரிய முதலியவற்றை அளந்தறியும் பிரமாணமாம் ; பொறி முதலியன அதற்கு வாயிலாதல் பற்றிப் பிரமாணமென்று உபசரித்துக் கூறப் படுவனவேயாம் என்பது சைவசித்தாந்த மென்பார் 'புகலள வைகளவாகி' என்றார்.—சிவஞானபாடியம். 2-ம் சூத். முதலதிகரணம்.

Experience is only deeper cognition; that is, cognitional ingress, which implies both cognition of and being in the object. Hence all experiences imply duality viz., the subject and the object of experience; only, at the time of experience, the self, which is the subject of experience, does not feel conscious of its own existence apart from the object. It identifies itself with the object and loses itself in the predominent nature of the object and becomes coloured by that nature even as a crystal assumes the colour of the thing that is contiguous to it.

It is to be noted in this connection that the self's cognition of objects in its culmination assumes one of two forms, viz., either attachment to or detachment from the object of cognition. In the first case, it is cognitional ingress or experience; and, in the other case, it is discrimination of the self as being not the object of cognition. In the first case, it is *soham* (I am it), and, in the other, it is *neti* (I am not it). Thus when the words, *attachment* and *detachment*, are used with reference to the self, which is all pervasive, they do not signify movement or change of position on the part of the self, but they signify only these particular phases of cognition.'[4]

In the light of the above explanation, the self while it experiences an object may be said to be one with the object, as, at that time, it loses itself in the object of experience and identifies itself with it. In worldly experiences, it is one with the worldly object i.e., the modifications of Buddhi as satva, rajasa or tamasa according as the predominent nature of the object of cognition is one or the other of these three gunas. In the spiritual experience which is called *Bhuma* (endless Bliss), it is one with the Supreme, whose essence is Bliss, or Sivam. In either case, the relation between the individual self and the object of experience

is *ananya* or *Advaita*, i. e., inseparable togetherness of two distinct realities. Hence the relation expressed by the highest teaching of the Upanishads viz., the Maha Vakyas, is *Upacharita Aikya* (union) and not Nirupacharita Aikya, i.e. unqualified identity (Unity) as Sri Sankara has taken.

A quotation from the famous South Indian Saint Sri Manickavachakar will make the idea clearer : In his great work of inimitable poetic beauty, Tiruchitrambalakkovaiyar, he deals with the subject of love in its purest form, idealising it while yet making it realistic, and describing its various stages under various conditions. There he depicts the ideal lover who has had union with his beloved under the influence of the Divine will. The lover speaks of his experience, the blissful union with his beloved in the following words :— "Being influenced by good fortune, I have had the experience *of being she* (நான் இவள் ஆம்), in which state she was like embrosia and I its delicious taste, which does not stand as a thing apart from it. Who can understand the beauty of this experience which implies duality, the experience and the experienced, while yet remaining one ?" [15]

Here the expression, நான் இவள் ஆம், (I being she), used by the great saint is, it must be noted, reminiscent of the great expression '*Aham Brahmasmi*' (I am Brahman) ; and as such it has more than mere poetical significance. It is the outcome of the spiritual experience or the God consciousness of the Saint It is the expression of the philosophic consciousness that intends to intrepret or throw light on the spiritual expericnce or realization that it has had. The highest spiritual experience is compared to the highest and the purert of all the worldly experiences which an ideal youug couple can have in their union. *Thus Saiva Siddhanta*, which is only an organized or systematized synthetic interpretation and presentation of the highest spiritual experiences that the Hindu saints

and sages have had and given expression to through the ages, *give a specific interpretation to Vedanta.* The *interpretation is* that *the individual self in its attainment of the final goal, while yet remaining a reality, loses its individuality or egoism in divine union and identifies itself with the Supreme Self*, which identification alone will ensure it the endless Bliss which is the characteristic of the Supreme.

The end determines the means. Hence the path of realization as explained in Saiva-Siddhanta is as follows : –

The individual selves, which are enshrouded by mala, the evil principle, from the beginningless past, were given the organism with its psychic equipment so that they may undergo the cycle of birth and death and thereby realize their eternal right of union with the Supreme by throwing off the shroud after due processes of spiritual evolution. Throughout this evolution, the Supreme Self is influencing the individual selves, being immanent in them as the Self of the selves and enabling them to function with the organism in the environment provided. The self, though by nature self conscious, is always object-conscious owing to the influence of the evil principle and so is ignorant of the Supreme. When such a self becomes mature to receive spiritual enlightenment, the Supreme which has been within as a silent witness of the self's thoughts and actions appears in the form of a spiritual preceptor and initiates it in the path of Realization. Now under the direction of the master, the self will contemplate on its own true nature. This contemplation enables the self to objectify all its physical adjuncts as being things different from it and get itself detached from them by discrimination. At this stage its consciousness becomes pure, free from the influence of the adjuncts, and will remain self centred.

In this pure consciousness, the Divine Grace, Shiva Chaitanya, which has always been their within aiding its action, manifests itsels in the self. So at this stage, the self will feel, "I am Brahman" This 'Aham Brahmasmi" experience is only an intermediate one ; this is the result of the last vestiges of the evil principle called egoism or *vasana* mala. Here if the self realizes that at the basis of this experience there is Divine Grace and surrenders itself to that grace and allows itself to be led by it, the Supreme in the form of endless Bliss (Sivam) is realized and experienced. This is the highest spiritual experience pointed out by Saiva-Siddhanta. It is called "Shiva-Bhoga." This is the direct and immediate consequence of the realization on the part of the individual self of its eternal dependence on Paramatma and complete surrender of its power of cognition, will and desire to those of the Paramatma. This realization is called Shivajnana, the highest modality or the deepest status of which is submission or surrender to the Supreme which harmonizes and identifies the self with the Supreme. Here the self is completely free from the influences of the evil principle and of the physical or psychical adjuncts, maya and karma, and is turned Godward. If such a self turns worldward, all its activities are performed as God-ordained or Spirit-directed and this state in the life of a perfect man is called technically " Shivayoga. " It is natural for the self that is experiencing the state of 'Shivayoga' to lift itself to the higher state of " Shiva Bhoga. " For this the sadhana enjoined is the 'advaita bhavana' as indicated by the Siddhanta Mahavakya, "Sivohamasmi" (Shivam I am). By this the self will catch the Divine Qualities of the Supreme and enjoy endless peace and Bliss, being rid of the effects of the evil principle. This Bhavana may be compared to the Garudoham bhavana performed by a person conversant with mystic spells. He thinks while chanting the spell that he is one with the spell

and his self becomes possessed of the qualities of the spell in accordance with the dictum of Sarvajnānottara, Sarvē dharmāt manassanti (quoted already)–(The qualities of all things are to the individual self.) So he is able to remove the evil effects of the snake bite by his mere look with that bhāvana within.

Thus we see how Saiva-Siddhānta gives a practical interpretation to the highest teaching of the Upanishads viz., the Mahāvakyas and guides men to attain the end implied therein without bringning in any petty theory or verbal jugglery. For this and similar other reasons it is called the essence of Vedānta.

Compare : Advaitam āgama sirobhih upāsanāya/ yuktam taveti paramārtatayāhna vācyam etc.

(135 Shruti Shūkti māla by
Sri Haradattāchārya)

(My Lord, the Upanishads mention 'advaita bhāvana' (Sivoham) in your worship. But it is not proper to attribute Nirupacharita Aikya (absolute identity) to the individual self and the Supreme on that account ; for it is evident that the charmer is different from the mystic spell of *Garuda* which he practices, but still the '*Garudoham bhāvana*' does not fail to counteract the poisonous effects of the snake bite. Even so the advaita bhāvana mentioned in the Upanishads is necessary for getting rid of the evil effects of the mala.)

(2) Also compare :

"கண்டவிவை யல்லேனான் என்றகன்று காணாக்
கழிபரமு நானல்லே னெனக்கருதிக் கசிந்த
தொண்டினொடும் உளத்தவன்றான் நின்றகலப் பாலே
சோகமெனப் பாவிக்கத் தோன்றுவன் வேறின்றி
விண்டகலு மலங்களெல்லாம் கருடதி யானத்தால்
விடமொழியு மதுபோல விமலதையு மடையும்
பண்டைமறைகளும் அதுநா னானேன் என்று
பாவிக்கச் சொல்லுவதிப் பாவகத்தைக் காணே"

(303 Sivajnana Siddhi-supaksha-)

The self which erroneously thinks that it is the organism in the state of bondage and parabrahman when it leaves it, must see that it is neither the one, which is the realm of the finite objective cognition; nor the other, which is above that finite objective approach, and leave its adjuncts, viz., the organism with all its psychic equipment. If, then, it realizes its eternal dependence on the Supreme and the immanence of the Supreme in all its actions, and meditates, "*He I am*", with devotion and complete self-effacement, the Supreme absorbs the self in Its all pervasive nature, identifies Itself with it and makes it pure, removing all traces of mala, even as the mystic spell of Garuda is one with the charmer who has performed Garudoham bhavana and removes the poison. This is what is meant by the Upanishads when they enjoin the meditation, 'That I became'.)

SOME of the important questions raised in the discussion that followed and the Answers given :—

Q. Have the Saiva-Siddhantins commented on 'Brahma Sutras'?

A. Saiva-Siddhantins do not attach the greatest importance to the Brahma Sutras. They are just as imporrant with respect to the Upanishads or Vedanta as Purva Mimamsa or Jaimini Sutras are with respect to the Vedas. They attach the greatest importance to the Sivajnana Bodha Sutras that are, in their opinion, faultless and all comprehensive. Further, they see some of the Vyasasutras contradictory to the express sayings of the Upanishads; for example, the Sutra, 'Parinamat' is contradictory to the Upanishadic text "*Mayantu Prakritim Vidyat Mayinantu Mahesvaram*". But still they follow the commentary of Sri Kantacharya on the Brahma Sutras.

Q. Do you consider Srikantacharya as a Saiva Siddhantin ?

A. Strictly speaking his commentary is said to represent Sivadvaita Saivam. But the differences between Sivadvaita Saivam and Siddhanta Saivam are only with respect to terminology, not in spirit. So we may take Srikantacharya to be a Saiva Siddhantin.

Q. Have Saiva-Siddhantins commented on the Upanishads ?

A. Why ? The Jnana padas of all the Saiva-Agamas are only commentaries on the Upanishads. It is because of this fact that the Saiva-Siddhantins desire that the Upanishads should be understood so as not to contradict with the Agamanta. In the opinion of the Saiva Siddhantins Vedanta and Agamanta are related to each other as Sutras and their Bhashya ; the first is intended for secular minded, who wish to know things, and truths are expressed in a grosser form in it, whereas the second is intended for those that desire to realize and experience and hence in the latter spiritual truths are expressed in a subtler and more detailed manner. Vide Sivajnana Siddhiar—stanza 267 of Supaksha.

THE FORM OF THE FORMLESS

(Lecture delivered on 20—11—51 at 3 p. m., in the B. H. U. with Dr. S. K. Maitra, M. A., Ph. D., Ex-Head of the Department of Philosophy, B.H.U.)

From my yesterday's lecture, it might be clear, to some extent at least, that Saiva Sidhanta is an exposition of

the highest findings of the Upanishads and that it opens out a thoroughly reasoned system of practical philosophy. The system neither contradicts our experience nor causes violence to the most cherished of our sentiments, but establishes a true relation between the Supreme, the individual self and the world of matter while preserving the essential difference between these fundamental entities. The same practical leaning while strictly adhering to the deepest findings of the scripture can be seen even in the symbolism used in the system. I shall take, for instance, the Form that has been assigned to the Formless in the Religious counterpart of the system.

God is essentially spiritual and so formless. But still there is the hankering on the part of a man to have personal relation with Him. If God is purely transcendental and if man cannot know Him in any way or cannot have anything to do with Him, then what is the use of having faith in Him ?

Saint Arul Nandi Sivacharya states the same thing thus in the seventh sutra :— "If God is unknowable, then there can be no use of Him; He cannot meet us, nor can we unite with Him ; He cannot perform anything for our benefit: and His existence may as well be likened unto a garland prepared of flowers of the sky or unto a rope made of the hairs of the tortoise".[1]

Hence we have to give a form to the formless ; only that form should not be inadequate or derogatory to the true nature of God. The Form of Sivalinga is one such. The significance of the form has to be considered in various aspects. But now my object is to throw light on the fact that, in the Saiva religious practice, it does not take the place

1. Siddhi—Supakasha—243.

of the original but that it only symbolically represents the original, the symbol being transfigured by the imagination to the level of the spiritual. The form that is given to the Supreme even by imagination is not anything like the organism that the individual self is equipped with. The organism of ours is the result of our Karma and is the product of *Prakriti* ; God is above Karma and His body cannot be of Prakriti. His form is purely spiritual, Jnana. Note the significance of the mantra, 'Vidyā Dehāya Namah' used in the worship. God is considered to have body of *Vidyā* or Jnāna.

Now let me quote, from Mrigendra, the pertinent portions:— Mulādyasambhavāt-sāktam tadvapuh-naitādrisam Prabhōh.

(God has not the binding principles viz., mulamala (the root cause of all the evils), karma, etc ; and so His body is not like that of ours, but is Shaktimaya, is of grace.)

Tadvapuh panchabih mantraih-pancha-krityopayogibhih

(His body is said to be of the mantras, Ishana, Tatpurusha, Aghora, Vāmadeva and Sadyojata, which are repectively serviceable in the cosmic actions, Anugraha, Tirobhava, Samhara, Sthiti and Srishti and they are respectively the head etc.)

I shall explain the philosophic significance of these as briefly as possible: So long as man is in the state of bondage, he can get an idea of God, the unknown, only as related to the world which is known. He cannot have direct knowledge

---

1. Patilakshana pariksha prakarana—7½.
2. —8½. This sloka is translated verbatim by Sivagra Yogi while commenting on st. 59 of the First sutra, Sivagnanasiddhiyar. The word vapuh (body) here is interpreted as that which nourishes (with boons) those that meditate on it.

or experience of God unless and until he is freed from the bondage of karma etc. So it is usual for the scriptures to introduce the idea of God as something inferred from the cosmic changes. Man is taken from the known to the unknown. God is at the root of all the changes visible in the Phenomenal world. So God is at first conceived to be the First cause of the world. Thus the second of the Brahma Sutras defines Parabrahman as that from which the changes of this world proceed : ' Janmādyasa yatah '

(From where origin etc. of this ?)

Now what are the changes referred to ? The changes of this phenomenal world are usually classified under three heads, viz.. origination, progress and decay or technically Srishti, Sthiti and Samhara. Here it must be noted that Saiva Siddhanta holds like the Sankhya system that change cannot mean unreality. When water changes into ice or steam, water does not cease to exist ; only it exists in another form. So also, even in chemical changes the primordial substance behind each change does not cease to exist. So if we go behind the phenomenal world, analysing its causes, we shall ultimately reach a position where we meet with the ultimate primordial substance or the ultimate casual potential (Karanarupa Shakti) of both the macrocosm and microcosm. That state can only be imagined or conceived of as a Jada Sakti, the subtlest form of potential, capable of manifesting in the various grosser forms which we know either by direct perception, or by inference or from correct reports. This primordial substance or potential is bound to be eternal and limitless in space. It is termed Maya. This principle should not be confounded with Parabrahman.

The term *Maya* means that wherein everything is involved and wherefrom everything is evolved. (*ma* means

drawing in or involve; and *ya* means coming out or evolve). This maya postulated in Saiva Siddhanta, in conformity with the Svetasvatara Surti, [16] is a real entity. Be it noted that is not a mysterious Shakti of Ishvara, as Sankara would have it, just brought in to explain the appearance of the world of sentient and insentient beings, and then easily disposed of by the illogical, or a-logical statement, that 'it is not real, and is yet not unreal ; not partly real, and partly unreal.' This verbal jugglery is indulged in in order to deny true reality to the world which all our worldly experience affirms. Saiva Siddhanta here, as everywhere else, bases its theory on our experience of the reality of the world. A thing is not unreal because it changes. According to the system, substance has two aspects—in one it changes and in the other it is changeless. One is prakasa or manifested state, and the other is vimarsha or unmanifested state ; one is vyakti rupa or effected state, and the other is Shakti rupa or casual state. The causal state of the material world is maya. Creation is making patent and actual what is latent and potential. Again, though maya, viewed in this light, is shakti (potential) yet it is not Chit Shakti (consciousness-force). It is jada shakti, requiring an intelligent agent to operate on. Hence it is called the parigraha shakti of Shiva so as to distinguish it from His Tadatmya Chit Shakti. The relation of Shiva with Maya is one of *advaita* not *tadatmya*, whereas His relatson with His Chit Shakti (consciousness-force) is one of *tadatmya*.

Now this maya cannot function by itself, nor can the sentient beings, the individual selves, operate on it independently, for the latter require to have their consciousness-force illumined or made operative only with the aid of the products of maya So by the proof of exhaustion or elimination, we conclude that it is God, the all knowing and the all powerful, that is the independent efficient cause that

moves maya and aids the individual selves to have their consciousness-force awakened with its products. [17]

Now the question arises whether it is not necessary for God to have a body with which He could operate on maya. The answer is that He requires no body. Even as the individual self, the conscious ego behind the brain, operates on it without any vesture to itself, so also God who is pure Intelligence acts on maya, being Himself the main support or parama-adhara of maya. [18]

Maya is like the seed that sprouts in the moistened soil. God's will, the sankalpa of His consciousness-force, is the moisture. The sprout or the plant that comes out of the seed is the world. [19] God is the soul of the world and the world is His body.

Then what is the meaning of the Brahma Sutra cited ? In ordinary parlour, we say that a particular tree or plant grows in such and such soil. We only mean, thereby, that the soil referred to aids the growth of the tree or plant, and we do not lose sight of the fact that the tree or plant must grow out of its own seed or root. Also the word, *Pankajam*, a Sanskrit word for lotus, etymologically means that whieh comes out of watery mud ; but we know that lotus plant has its origin in its root, and that root, of course, must be implanted in watery mud so that it may sprout. Even so, the world, which is the effected state of maya is spoken of, by the Upanishads as well as the Brahma Sutra quoted above, as having been originated from the Para-brahman. Hence, to be consistent with the text of the Svetasvatara that asserts "Know maya to be Prakriti (procreatrix); and Mahesvara as its owner," we have to understand thereby that Para-Brahman, the efficient cause of the world, is also its main stay or support, whereas maya is the substantial cause or Upadana. This interpretation accords

not only with the Svetasvatata sruti quoted above but also with the observed facts of the worldly experience and the logical needs of organized knowledge.

Now the question naturally arises, "what is the purpose of cosmic creation ?" Generally this question is answered by saying that it is the play of the Para Brahman. This answer cannot satisfy anybody, at any rate, it does not satisfy a Saiva Siddhantin. By the word, play, we may mean that the work of cosmic creation is not a hard task requiring great effort on the part of Para-Brahman ; it is only a play, that is, a work that is easily done. But this interpretation does not answer the question raised.[20]

Again, we cannot say that creation is purposeless, for Para-Brahman, the author of creation, is an Intelligent being and we cannot attribute any purposeless or mischievous act to such a Being. The correct answer has to be sought once again in the observed facts. The cosmic changes that are accepted by our scriptures to be cyclic may be compared to an educational institution, which re-opens after long vacation (srishti), does work during the terms (sthiti) and, at the end of the year, is closed (Samhara) to be reopened after the vacation (Punassrishti). There are holidays and recesses even after the reopening. These may be taken to represent the intermediate cataclysms, the period of rest after death and the hours of daily rest. Now pressing the analogy into service, the institution is for the students. When the institution is kept opened, the students learn, and when it closes they take rest. Similarly the cosmic creation is for the individual selves, who are steeped in inner darkness. These selves strive and struggle to get rid of the inner darkness while they are embodied and allowed to undergo the cycle of birth and death in accordance with the law of Karma. So Saiva Siddhanta

postulates the existence of an Evil principle, *Anava*, and states that the world is created in order to remedy this evil Principle that was preexistent and precosmic, affecting the individual selves in various degrees and grades. It is this principle that was termed 'Mulam' in the first of the Agama slokas quoted above. The term *'anjana'* * occurring in the text of Mundaka Upanishat also denotes this preexistent and precosmic evil or defect, to remedy which the world is created.

Now we are led to think of two more cosmic actions. The three actions usually mentioned are effected on the insentient or material world ; and if we transfer them to the sentient beings or the world of selves, Srishti will mean furnishing the selves with organism with all the psychic equipment in it, sthiti will mean enabling the selves to dwell in the organism and function in the world, and samhara will mean separating the organism from the self. These we respectively express by the words birth, life and death. The selves, while undergoing the cycle of birth and death, evolve spiritually. It is for this spiritual growth which consists in shaking off the binding clutches of mala that God has undertaken the work of creation and, being the Self of the selves, guides and aids them to get rid of the disease of Mula Mala. This help that is being rendered to the selves without their knowledge of it is termed *Tirobhava*, and when the self becomes sufficiently matured, God, who has been guiding and watching the growth of the self, appears in the form of a spiritual preceptor and initiates the self in the path of Divine wisdom. This act on the part of

* (One who knows Para Brahman is absolved from good and evil and becomes cleansed of *anjana* i. e. Mala and attain Parama Samya (Moksha).

(Mundakam 3-1-3)

God, which consists in completely releasing the self from its bondage and enabling it to have experience of Himself—the Supreme Bliss—is called Anugraha. Thus we have five cosmic functions.

All these ideas are summed up in the first sutra or sloka of the Kamika Agama thus:

"The supreme Being, Siva is eternally free from mala (impurity) and hence His power of cognizing and motivating all things (i.e., His Conciousness-Force) is unhindered; the individual selves, on the other hand, were beginninglessly contaminated by impurity and so their powers of cognition and will are bound down and hindered; thus they have become finite (anu).* Such Siva frees such selves from the ties of bondage and helps them attain Sivatva, i.e., helps them to become one with Him and enjoy Supreme Bliss."

Now, it must become clear, that the individual selves require a physical organism with all the psychic equipment in it for their consciousness-force to become manifested and operate on the external world, because their consciousness-force is hindered or bound down by what is called Mulamala. But the Supreme Being has no need for such an organism. His Consciousness-Force is independent and free, and so can operate on the selves as well as on maya without the help of any lighter (vyanjaka). Here again it must be noted that maya is a real entity in Saiva Siddhanta and its essential nature is to dispel the effects of Mula mala of the selves to a certain extent and enlighten their consciousness-force. Hence it is analogous to light whereas the Mula mala (Anava) is analogous to darkness. Now we may say, that, in the case of God, His Consciousness-Force, which is free, independent, self luminous and self operative, does to Him what is done to us by the physical organism. It is to Him His body, the instrumental cause, in respect of the cosmic functions.

Here I may be allowed to quote a portion of a stanza from Tirukkalitrupadiyar which expresses this idea with clarity, precision and exquisite poetic beauty :

> “ நங்கையினால் நாமனைத்தும் செய்தாற்போல் நாடனைத்தும்
> நங்கையினால் செய்தளிக்கும் நாயகனும் ”—
>
> (St. 78)

—Even as we perform all our actions with our hands, so does Lord create and protect all the world with His consort, His Consciousness-Force.—Note the pun on the word ‘நங்கை’.

which when split up into two words நம் and கை means our hands, and when taken as a single word means “ a lady ”. With regard to the use of the word ‘நங்கை’ (consort) as a synonym of Consciousness-Force of Para Brahman, I feel bound to quote the following Daitriya Aranyaka :

“His body, which is Brahma Vidya in essence, is called Uma,”

Let me try to bring out the significance implied in the analogy used in the Tamil stanza :—The analogy is intended to clarify God’s relation with His creation as well as with His Chit Shakti.

Now the book which is placed before me on the table is a thing different from me. I wish to open it. To perform this action on the book, first of all a relation must be established between me and the book. Hence, first, I touch or hold the book. Now a relation (Samyoga in the language of Indian logic) between me and the book is established. Then to open the book, I move my hands and fingers while firmly holding the book. This action is possible only because my

* The evil principle which binds the powers of the self and thus limits it so as to be called *anu* is called *anava*.

body, hands and fingers are so formed as to perform this work, that is, the body by virtue of its being formed as a whole with suitable parts, is adapted to the work. That is, the potential differentiation in the body enables the establishment of its relation with and the consequent action on the book. Similarly, for the Supreme Being to act on the selves or on the world of matter, there should first of all be a relation, in as much as they are real entities different from the Supreme. This relation is *advaita*, according to Saiva Siddhanta.[22] The relation expressed by the term *advaita* is not one of identity which exists between Gold and the ornament made of it; it is not one of exclusive difference as illustrated by light and darkness ; nor is it identity and difference (Bedha abedha) as illustrated by a word and its meaning. But the relation is one in which all these three are implied. It is expressed by Meykandar in the phrase "அவையே தானே ஆய்" (He is the selves and is Himself)—the expression being cast in the form of the Mahavakyas, be it noted. St. Arulnandi Sivacharya expands the meaning of the phrase following Thirugnana Sambandhar, in the words "உலகெலாமாகி வேறுயுடனுமாய் ஒளியாய் ஓங்கி" (He is one with the selves, different from them and is immediate with them and is called Shakti in that aspect.) Now let me explain this further:–God's oneness with the self is illustrated by the relation between the self and its organism. We give a name, say, Rama, to the physical body, and call the person by the name; the response comes from the self. This is because, the self though different from the body identifies itself with the body and acts as one with it. The self cannot be the body, nor can the body be the self. But still the self can identify itself with the body and be one with it when it actuates it, while being different from it when discriminating it as something apart from it. The same cannot be said with respect to the body. So also God is not self, and

the self is not God ; but still God is one with the self by His connection with it and yet is different from it.[2]

His essential difference from the self, without ceasing to have inseparable connection with it, is illustrated by the relation between the sensitiveness of the optic nerve and the action of the light rays on it, in the act of seeing. In the act of seeing an object, the sensitiveness of the optic nerve is different from the light that falls on it though there is inseparable connection between the two. In the same manner, the self requires to be illumined by Sivajnana while cognizing objects, and here, though there is inseparable connection between the two, there is essential difference, as one is the shower (luminous) and the other is the seer (enlightend).[3]

His immediacy (i.e. togetherness in operation) is illustrated by the relation between the self's power of cognition and the action of the optic nerve in the act of perception or seeing. When we see an object, the eye is directed by the self towards the object, and there is action on the part of the eye as well as the self. The act of seeing is one ; but still it implies the act of seeing on the part of the eye and the simultaneous act of sense-perception on the part of the self. Here the relation between the sensitiveness of the eye and the cognitive power of the self is neither one of identity nor of exclusive difference. Oneness and difference coexist equally balanced. This is the best illustration for the relation of *advaita*, which word means *ananya* or inseparable togetherness as already pointed out in my yesterday's lecture.[2 3]

Now if this relation should exist between the selves or the world of matter on one hand and Para Brahman on the other, Para Brahman must of necessity be conceived as being dual in nature, Siva, when considered by Himself as being self-luminous, and Shakti (Consciousness-Force)

when considered in His relation with the selves and the world of matter.[24] Deep thinkers who thought along this line were so much influenced by their critical acumen and self conviction that they derived this dual implication or potential differentiation in the concept of Parabrahman from the word '*Sat*' which is used to denote Parabrahman in the Upanishads.

Thus we have the *Abhiyukta sukti, which means* :

"Shakti and Shivah are expressed by the Prakriti (root) and Pratyaya (termination) respectively of the word 'Sat' ; by their sameness and union with the world, they became all this world."

In respect of the later part of the sloka, it is worth noting that since Shiva is in advaita relation with the world (i.e., since He is one with, different from and immediate with the world through His Shakti), He is said to be all this world, by secondary application *(Upachara)*. The following Haradattacharya's saying is worth noting :—

"Maheshvara, the shastras that are your creation express you by secondary application as Visvarupi (as world itself) in as much as you abide in and direct it ; the learned that know how to interpret the Vedas know the true intention behind the expression. But men with clouded vision fail to grasp the real meaning, misguided by the mere form of the expression" *

Now from the above discussion, we arrive at the conclusion that if we have to form an idea as to the real nature of God, it is but proper that we conceive of Him as the author of the five cosmic actions, viz:, *Srishti, Sthiti, Samhara, Tirobhava and Anugraha* and know that these actions are

* Cited by Srikantacharya in 1-1-6.

performed by Him not with any organism like those of ours created of maya but that He performs them by His mere will power or with the Consciousness-Force as His body or *Karana.* Now I must tell you that the second of the Vyasa-sutras, which has already been referred to, points to the same conclusion : The sutra means

"From which origin etc. of this (world) ?"

In the first sutra, Para Brahman is mentioned by the name *(Uddesa.)* So the second sutra is understood to give its *Lakshana* (definition). The full import of this sutra according to Srikantacharya, is '*Brahman is that Omniscient, Omnipotent cause from which proceed the origin, sustenance, dissolution, Tirobhava and Anugraha of this world of sentient and insentient entities.*' The reason for taking the cosmic changes indicated by the word 'Janmadi' in the sutra as five instead of three has already been given.

Now, if we attribute the authorship of the five cosmic functions to Para Brahman, it logically follows that Para Brahman must be endowed with certain indispensable qualities without which He cannot perform them. These qualities are enumerated as six in number, viz., *Sarvajnata* (omniscience), *Nitya Triptitvam* (endless Bliss or perfection), *Anadi Bodham* (innate unhindered intelligence), *Swatantrata* (Independence), *Alupta Shakti* (Grace or immutable power) and *Ananta Shakti* (Omnipotence). [25] So these qualities go to constitute our concept of Divinity :

" These six qualities are spoken of as six *angas* for Mahesvara the Omnipresent."

With this philosophic back ground, let us now turn to the Form of the Formless, Siva Linga, the symbol of God :

*48th Sloka of Shruti Sukti Mala

First and Foremost, the aptness of the symbol being neither Form nor Formless, or being both Form and Formless, must be considered, for God is neither known nor unknown. If we say that God is known, that He is cognizable, then He must be one among the things objectified by our directed cognition, and all the things so objectified are asat (subject to change) and hence also achit or Jada (insentient). On the other hand, if we say that He cannot be cognized in any way, He cannot be a reality at all (as we have already had occasion to point out). Then how to solve the dilemma ? The real position is, He is neither cognizable nor noncognizable. He is not cognizable with the objective consciousness i.e., by the self's consciousness directed externally. But He is experienced by the self, when the self's consciousness is turned inward, and when it performs *ananya bhavana with His Grace.* As God is not cognizable to the self's objective consciousness, He is *chit* ; and as He is experienced by the self through His Grace in advaita or inseparable state, He is *sat*. So, in His absolute nature, God is Chit Sat or Siva Sat. Here the word *Siva* means chit. This is briefly the content of the sixth sutra.[26] For the benefit of those of you who wish to remember the idea, I shall give the translation of the Sutra.

(If God's svarupa is not at all cognizable in any way, His asat bhava follows : if He is an object of the directed knowledge, then His insentiency follows Hence the seers feel that He is cognized with His Grace, which position is neither the one nor the other of the two alternatives suggested at first.)

Now with this idea in mind of the absolute nature of Para Brahman, which is termed *Siva sat* for valid reasons, I request you to note how significant it is that the Supreme should be represented in the form of Sivalinga, which at once indicates that God is neither cognizable objectively nor noncognizable. This apart, our mind always requires something

to concentrate on; and at the same time, we should not allow the mind to have the impression that God is one among the various objects that we see in the world. Please note how this psychological need is fulfilled without causing violence to the philosophic need. We direct our mind to the Form Sivalinga and concentrate on it; and the Form which is formless (in the sense that it does not give any bodily shape) by its suggestion takes us to the region of the spiritual. As we have already seen, our scriptures direct us to think of Para Brahman as the primary cause behind the Physical life of the world; and the Sivalinga does the same thing to us. The form of Sivalinga is a combination of *peetham* or seat, a three dimensional circle below, and lingam, a three dimensional straight line above. When these are written two dimensionally they take the form, (ட), (a circle followed by a straight line) which, in South India, we call *Pillaiyar Suzhi*, the symbol of Ganesha, the God personifying *pranava*. The circular form is called *Bindu*, and the form of the straight line or dandakaram is called *Nada*.

—From *Vatulagama*.

"Nada is linga; and Bindu is Peetha, so it is said"

Nada is the stress, pressure or push, which is administered by God's Jnanasakthi (Consciousness-Force) to Kundalini or Suddha Maya, and Bindu the circular wavy motion generated in Kundalani. The combination of these two is at the root of cosmic creation. This truth our ancestors must have found out from *Yogi Pratyaksha*, for they ask us to see this and such other things in ourselves by Yogic practice. But this idea seems to conform to the latest tendency of modern physics, which resolves the whole material universe into two kinds of waves—' a kind which goes round and round in circles, and a kind which travels in straight lines."*

In actual worship, the seat or the circular peetham is transfigured by imagination so as to represent a lotus, whose

various parts indicate the various cosmological elements called *tatvas* that are postulated and enumerated in the system. For the present we may roughly take the *tatvas* to be the objects and vestures of the individual self, which aid the manifestation of and condition its consciousness so that the consciousness of the self issues forth in the form of various faculties. In Saiva Siddhanta these tatvas are 36 in number and are classified under three heads, the *atma* tatvas, the *vidya tatvas* and the *Siva tatvas*. Atma tatvas are 24 in number and they are almost the same as are enumerated in the Sankhya system, all being (geneological) products of mulaprakriti. Beyond these, seven tatvas are postulated as products of Asuddhamaya, which is subtler than Prakriti. These tatvas together form a vesture to the self and aid it to have its powers of cognition, will and action manifested in a general way so that it may have connection with the other external tatvas in the case of Nirvikalpa and Savikalpa Pratyaksha Jnana of the external objects, and objectify Buddhi itself and experience it as pleasure, pain or stupor in what is called *Svavedana Pratyaksha*. These are the vidya tatvas. The second mantra of the first adhyaya of Svetasvatara is cited and interpreted so as to indicate these tatvas. It means :

"It is to be considered (whether Brahman, the cause is) Kala (time), Svabhavo (Kala), Niyati (Destiny) Yadricha (Raga), Bhuta (vidya), yoni (maya), or purusha (the self equipped with these".

Five other tatvas mentioned by Brihat Jabala. 4, 19, are Siva, Shakti Sadakhya, Esvara and (Suddha) vidya. They are called Siva tatvas. These are the modifications of Suddha maya and these impel or direct the other 31 tatvas in the same way as the nervous system directs and controls

* Sir James Jeans, the mysterious universe-page 68,

the muscular system in our organism. The Siva tatvas are directly acted on by God's Consciousness-Force.

The stalk and the outer petals of the lotus are the thirty one lower tatvas, whereas the Sivatatvas constitute the eight inner petals which are white in colour and turned upward, and stamen, pistil and overy. These parts are to be meditated on in order and flowers placed on them, in worship. This part of the worship, which is called the puja of asana, is to remind us that God is all pervasive and is immanent in the world of tatvas through His Chit Shakti. At the same time, be it noted, He is above these tatvas, or tatvatita,

Now the Linga, which is the representation of Nada is transfigured by imagination so as to represent the *Vydyadeha* of God. Vidyadeha is that constituted by the five mantras indicated by Mrigendra sloka. The word 'mantra' is analysed into two elements expressing *Mananam* and *tranam* meaning respectively thinking and protecting. So the word primarily denotes Shiva-Shakti (the Consciousness-Force of Para Brahman), which protects those that meditate on or think and worship it. By secondary application it is used to refer to the expressions or formulae that denote the various aspects of Shiva Shakti. The five mantras are :

1. Ishanamurdhaya namah
2. Tat purusha vaktraya namah
3. Aghora hridayaya Namah
4. Vamadeva Guhyaya Namah
5. Sadyo Jata murtaye Namah

These five mantras denote respectively the five aspects of Shiva-Shakti effecting the five cosmic functions, viz.,

Anugraha, *Tirobhava*, *Samhara*, *Sthiti* and *Srishti* and these five aspects are to be considered as the head, face, heart, the hidden parts of the body, and the whole form and other parts respectively of the Vidyadeha.

To these five are usually added the following six, called *Anga* mantras :

(1) Hridayaya Namah
(2) Shirase Namah
(3) Shikhayai Namah
(4) Kavachaya Namah
(5) Netrebhyo Namah
(6) Astraya Namah

These denote the qualities, Omniscience, Endless Bliss, Unhindered Intelligence, Independence, Immutable power or Grace and Omnipotence respectively. It must be noted that these qualities are not the manifestation of the one or the other of the three gunas, satva, rajas and tamas, which are the products of mulaprakriti ; nor are they of the nature of Asuddha maya or even of Suddha maya, the Kundalini. But these are of the nature of Grace or Pure Intelligence, that is, they are spiritual, or, are of the essence of the Para Brahman.

Here I have attempted to give the implication of the *Mantra Sarira* assigned to God in Saiva Siddhanta rather roughly. To know their full significance one should study the pertinent portions of the Jnana pada and Kriya Pada of the Agamas. But still, to indicate the need for such a specialized study, I give here the translation of the concluding sutras of the *pathilakshna pariksha Prakarna of Mrigendra*: The sutras explain the meaning of the five great mantras noted above as follows :—

1. "As the Lord is capable of controlling and obliging all living beings in all the ways, and as His Shakti is the

highest even as the head is the highest part of the body, He is denoted by the expression "*Ishana Murdha*" not that He has head."

2. "Since the Lord abides in, controls and directs the bodies of all the living beings, He is *Tatpurusha*--the soul of them ; since He makes their *Jnana Shakti* manifest and protects them by removing their fear of birth and death He is *Vaktrah*. So He is *Tatpurusha Vaktrakah*."

3. "The word *Hridayam* is a synonym for *Jnana* and this *Jnana* which is the form of Shiva is not frightful, but auspicious and propitious. Hence He is denoted by *Aghora Hridaya*. But still, since the Asuddhadva (i.e., Asudha maya and mula prakriti, which are His *Parigraha Shakti* which he directs) is frightful and hideous in nature, Ghoratvam or frightfulness is attributed to Him by secondary application.

4. "Of the four Purusharthas, the first three (*Dharma, artha and kama)* are called *vamam*, as they are of a lower order. The word *deva* indicates light (*Tejas). Guhya* means secret or hidden. As the light of grace makes the living beings experience the first three of the four Purusharthas while remaining hidden from their cognition, it is called *Vama deva Guhya*:

5. "The Lord creates organisms for the living beings in accordance with their *Karma* instantly by His will power. He also confers on yogins bodies of the nature of mantras, creating them instantly. Hence by the quickness of His creative activity, He is called *Sadyojata Murti* ; not that He has *murti* or form.

6. "In truth, the Lord has no body ; but since His Shakti (Consciousness Force) does the work of the body to Him, it is said to be His body. His Shakti is one ; but as the effects of its activity are many, the classification of it as Vama etc,, is attributed to it by Great men."

SRI PANCHAKSHARA

(Lecture delivered on the 21st November, 1951 at B. H. U. with Swami Aghedananda (Dr. Fisher, M.A., Ph. D., Vienna), Honorary Professor of Philosophy of B.H.U., in the chair)

In Saiva Siddhanta, the expression '*Shivayanamah*' is held to be the most sacred of all the names of the Supreme that are generally meditated on by the Hindus. This expression is being used for ages by the saintly seers as a succinct and all embracing formula giving the grand synthesis of Truth underlying our life here and hereafter. It embodies the whole system of Saiva Siddhanta philosophy in its essence. It is the *Mahavakya* of the *Mahavakyas*, if I may say so. Saint Umapathi Sivacharya says in one of his Tamil works, "All the scriptures, the Agamas, the Vedas and others are only expositions of the sacred five (letters), if we discern."*

There are different forms of this grand expression, varying in the arrangement of the letters, and they are construed in different ways so as to denote and suit the different stages of the spiritual attainment of the aspirant who treads the path of realization. It is the purpose of this my concluding lecture to expound the significance of this sacred name of the Lord in as brief a manner as possible.

As I have already said in my previous lectures, the centre round which our enquiry or philosophic discussion

---

* அருணூலும் ஆரணமும் அல்லாதும் அஞ்சின்
பொருணூல் தெரியப் புகின்—

revolves is the individual conscious self, as it is this ego that is the subject of all experiences and the interpreter thereof. Hence no system of metaphysics can afford to lose sight of this entity. If you deny the existence of this principle, you deny the existence of the man who philosophises, and there can be no philosophy. Now this *self* is denoted by the letter 'ya' of the grand expression.

The question has often been asked who this conscious self is. The simplest form of answer is that it is a self evident reality, for it is yourself and you have only to realize it by studying your inner nature. Now, let us try to find an answer so the question, "Who am I ?".

At first we are tempted to say, 'I am this organism, the physical body,' But on further consideration, it is seen that the organism is only a medium through which we contact the objective world and have experience of it. It is not our true self. For example, please consider, how you hear me now.

The sound waves caused by my speech move through the air and produce a certain impression on your ears. That impression causes a stimulation, which is carried as our physiologists say, by the auditory nerves to the brain cells. There again, a certain molecular change is produced. Now this molecular change causes the sensation of hearing. What is this sensation ? It is an understanding or an interpretation of the vibrations that have been transmitted through the organism as described above. It is a translation of the molecular change produced in the brain. If so, who is the interpreter or the translator ? It cannot be brain, for the brain is only the receiver on which the external vibrations leave a record of their impressions. It cannot be the vibra-tion or the stimulation, for they are only forms of motion,

whereas sensation is a form of knowing; nor can the interpreter be a temporary effect or product of these various forms of motion, for motion can produce only motion, not consciousness. Hence we are led to conclude that the interpreter or the knower of sensation is a conscious self, different from the organism, at whose door of consciousness external vibrations knock, and awaken him and make him aware of their presence. Thus. by reflecting on our internal nature or subjective side, we realize the existence of the oonscious self, which is the knower of all experiences.

Now let us listen to Meykandar, who, too, makes us realize the same truth by a different psychological approach. He says. "your very denial of the existence of the conscious self proves its existence :—"உளது இலதென்றலின் ஆன்மா', 3rd Sutra.*

A person who seeks to find out the conscious ego analyses his own physical and mental life and at last finds himself at a loss to know whether it is his physical body, the sense organs, the mind or a product of them all that cogitates. So he, naturally, concludes that, as the conscious ego cannot be identified with the one or the other of these, it simply does not exist. It is to such a person that Meykandar addresses himself in the above mentioned paradoxical statement. He explains his statement as follows :— While you know a thing and act, you identify yourself with the physical body, the sense organs, the mind and so on; and when you begin to reflect on your own true nature, you, the conscious ego, dissociate yourself from them but linger in the form of consciousness asserting that there is no atman (self). Realize that consciousness that still remains asserting thus to be your own self; you cannot deny the reality of

*c. f. The first argument of Descartes, 'I think, therefore, I am" (cogito, ergo sum)

this consciousness. If you deny, then you may as well be likened unto a man who says that he is dumb. You, who thus require to be awakened unto your own existence, are *pashu* (one that is bound), for you are in bondage. The adjuncts viz., the organism, the sense organs, the mind etc., which are the products of maya are different from you, for they aid you in your perception, cogitation and experience even as the lens aids a defective eye to see. So you are neither the one nor the other of the products of maya nor all of them together. Nor are you identical with the Parabrahman, which transcends maya, for it is self luminous not requiring to be enlightened through the products of maya.[27]

From the above discussion, it follows that there are three distinct eternal realities, viz., (1) the Para-Brahman, which is pure Intelligence—whose characteristic it is to know without requiring to be aided and to make others know, (2) the individual conscious selves that know when caused and aided to know, and (3) the world of matter that cannot know even if aided. Of these three, the Para-Brahman is one (Ekam), immutable (sat), and immanent in the other two principles (advaitam) ; the individual selves are innumerable as they are found to have different experiences being clothed in different organisms in accordance with the different grades of their spiritual development ; and the world of matter is that which is found to be useful to the individual selves as their physical body, the various gross and subtle organs therein, the world in which they dwell and move about while attached to the bodies, and the various objects of experience in it. There is also a fourth principle corresponding to the defect of the defective eye in the example cited. It is called mala, whose existence may be proved as follows:-The conscious self is both self-conscious and conscious of objects, as is revealed by our self expressions such as 'I know this' and 'I

do this.' The first personal pronoun, *I*, in such expressions, shows the self-conscious nature of the self ; and the transitive verbs in them show the objective turn of its consciousness-force. But it is our common experience that we cannot direct ourselves inwards towards the subjective side of our existence. It is easy for us to objectify external things ; but when we turn inward and try to meditate on ourselves the position becomes difficult to be maintained. It is something like this:- Suppose we place an empty earthen pot on the surface of a sheet of water with its mouth downward, and push it in. The pot is buoyed up in spite of its weight, which must take it down. Similarly, we are buoyed up when we try to contemplate on ourselves ; i.e., we are directed objectward. Now the buoyancy in the example is due to the upward pressure of water. So also there should be some principle to turn the self's consciousness force objectward and impel it towards the objective world, for it is the innate characteristic of the self to be self-conscious. This extraneous principle is the mala (impurity). It is the evil principle that has a screening influence on the self's consciousness-force, which by its very nature must be eternal and all pervasive. The finite manifestation of our consciousness limited by the ideas of space and time is due to this principle.[28]

Standard works on Saiva Siddhanta hold and maintain that it is neither the one nor the other of the various things that are held by the other schools of thought to be the cause for the limitation imposed on the self's consciousness-force. They are illusory knowledge, Absence of Jnana, Tamasa Guna, Avidya, Maya, Karma, Siva Shakti etc. The mala is different from all these ; and it is not a quality of the self. But it is an all pervasive and everlasting entity that shrouds and screens the self's consciousness. This principle, which deadens and imposes a limitation on our nature is denoted by the letter 'ma,' in the grand expression.

The letter 'si' denotes the Supreme Being that is the self of the selves and the primary efficient cause of all the phenomenal world 'va' denotes the consciousness-force or the Chit Shakti of the Parabrahman, which is both His quality and swarupa, even as light or luminosity is both the quality and Swarupa of the sun. The Chit Shakti or the Grace of the Para Brahman undertakes the cosmic functions in order to loosen the clutches of the evil principle on the individual self. The individual selves are actuated both from within and from without by the Parabrahman with His Chit Shakti as His *karana* so that the individual selves are subject to the five cosmic functions explained in my second lecture.

When we think of the Supreme as being the author of these five functions, i.e., when we conceive of Him as related to the world of matter and sentient beings, He is called *Pati* (one who protects) and His Shakti is called *Tirodana Shakti.* When He is considered with respect to His absolute nature, He is called Shiva and His Chit Shakti is called Grace (திருவருள்). Now in the grand expression, the letters 'si' and 'va' express the Parabrahman and His Grace as they are considered absolutely without being related to the five cosmic functions. The letter 'na' denotes the Lord's Shakti as being instrumental for the five cosmic functions.

Now let us proceed to consider the integrated or synthetic view of life which is signified by the grand expression, 'Sivayanamah'. The three philosophic categories recognized in Saiva Siddhanta are Pati, Pasu and Pasa. Of the three, Pati, though unquestionably one, has to be conceived of as having two aspects, one *the Siva aspect* in which He is considered absolutely as being self-luminous, and the other the *Sakti aspect* in which He is related to Pasu and Pasa and is considered to direct and control them. Pasa is of two

kinds, one the *Sahajamala* or the *anava*, which is also called the mulamala, and the other the *agandukamalas* viz., maya and karma (i.e. Nature and her inexorable laws). The Pasu has two states, one the state of bondage which has no beginning, but has an end ; and the other state of release, which has a definite beginning, but no end.

The conscious self or Pasu, 'ya' is beginninglessly shrouded in the mula mala, 'ma', and God, 'Siva' in view of the emancipation of the self, associates it with Nature and subjects it to His five fold operations, 'na'. The self being under the influence of the mula mala gets itself entangled in the fascinations of Nature and is moving in *samsara chakra*, the orbit which is the resultant of the two forces and which certainly shrinks up towards God' (Siva), for the forces of the mulamala are becoming weakened by degrees, whereas the Gracious influence of God continually acts without impairment.

Finally when the forces of the *mala* become completely effectless on the self, the self is in a position to realize the ever present *Grace*, 'va', within and without, which realization is granted it by God, who is an embodiment of love, and compassion. Now, with the eye of grace (va), the self (ya) realizes God (si) and experiences endless Bliss, which is the essence of Siva, the Life, Light and Love.

In the Grand Expression (Sivayanama), two letters (n a and ma) are one side : and two others (si and va) are on the other ; the letter (ya) is in the middle. The significance of this is expressed by Saint Umapathi Sivacharya as follows :—

"The Lord's manifestation in nature (Una natana) is on one side, and His Divine manifestation (Jnana natana) is on the other , look for the self in the middle."

ஊன நடனம் ஒருபால் ஒருபாலா
ஞானநடந் தானடுவே நாடு

Thiruvarul—IX, 3.

The source of Truth has two sides, the objective side and the subjective. The study of the objective side or the objective world is made by science and it brings us nearer to one aspect of the reality of Truth. Scientific researches begin upon sense perceptions, continue on them and depend upon them. By scientific inference the scientists have come to the conclusion that all the variety of the objective phenomena has been produced by the process of evolution from one homogeneous mass and that the simple fundamental entity which may take many forms, matter and radiation in particular, is conserved through all changes. This accords with the view held in Saiva Siddhanta of maya, the substantial cause of the known world. But the scientists refuse to go beyond. There has arisen a class of scientists like Sir Arthur Eddington and Sir James Jeans in modern times, who possess what may be termed scientific imagination, and they say that the phenomenal universe indicates an initiating consciousness-force and an intention behind it. These, in the language of the Grand expression, have a glimpse of the significance of na. They have not thought of ma which they are shrouded in, and the effect of ' na ' on ' ma '.

There are others who hold that all knowledge derived through sense perception from the practical affairs of life cannot be admitted to have permanent value for the reason that it is knowledge of individual things passing every moment out of existence and that only knowledge acquired through direct intuitive perception of a thing abstract and ever-existing should be accepted as true and valuable.

According to them, the knower, the self in us, is the knower of the universe and is the same in all living creatures; the individual knowers are parts of the cosmic knower and the sum total of the conscious selves is God. This is a fanciful theory just brought in to maintain a particular interpretation of certain texts of the Upanishads without any regard to the logical needs of consistency.

Now, with respect to the organs of knowledge, Saiva Siddhanta says that the instrument of knowledge is the self's consciousness-force, which always requires an aid with which alone it can measure things. In the state of bondage such aids are the *pratyaksha* (i. e, the sense organs, the antahkaranas and the vidya tatvas), *anumana* (inference) and *Agama* (scripture). But these aids are of the nature of the objective world; they are limited and subject to change. Hence the self's cognition with such aids is called *pasa Jnana* (consciousness of the objects). All things that are objectified with this *pasa jnana* are *asat* (subject to change). So *pasa jnana* or objective consciousness cannot bring us to the whole truth.

The self that discriminates itself from all its adjuncts such as the body, the sense organs, the mind, the intellect and so on, gets freed from *Pasa* and finds, no doubt, its true nature as illumined by the Lord's Grace.

An illustration will make my idea clearer: Suppose a crystal is placed near a flower. The crystal catches the colour of the flower and shines in it. Even here it is the sun's light that has enabled the crystal to possess and shine in the colour of the flower. This colour is not of the true nature of the crystal. So also the objective consciousness of the self which is coloured by the nature of the *pasa* is not its true nature.

Suppose the crystal is removed away from the flower. Now the crystal is seen to shine. Here, too, we should understand that the crystal shines because of the light of the sun ; so also the conscious self which has dissociated itself from *pasa* or its adjuncts, is certainly in the lap of the Lord's Grace and so it should realize that the all pervasive and all knowing nature that dawns upon it at that moment is due to its conjunction with the Supreme. But generally it is not realized and there is a self assertion on the part of such selves that they are Brahman. This *Aham Brahma Jnana* (the consciousness of the form, 'I am Brahman') is caused by the lingering traces of the evil principle and it is termed in Saiva Siddhanta as *Pasu Jnana.* This is perhaps what is referred to by the fanciful theories by their 'direct intuitive perception'. Beyond this experience, the self must realize that it has no existence independent of the Lord's Grace and no action other than that of the Lord. It is only then that the ray of supreme Bliss (*Suka Prabah)* is experienced. At this stage the Grace of the Lord leads the self's consciousness-force to the Lord and shows the Lord to the self, even as the eye that has been seeing things other than the sun with the sun's light turns towards the sun and sees it through its own light. This consciousness of the self which is aided by the Lord's Grace, 'va' is called *Siva Jnana.* Here the egoism or the individuality of the self finds an end to itself ; it dissolves, so to say, in the grace of the Supreme.

Hence the ninth sutra says :— "Realize the Supreme, who transcends both *Pasu Jnana* and *Pasa Jnana,* within you with the eye of Grace *(Siva Jnana)* ; if you regard the world of tattvas and their products as being impermanent and worthless like mirage, you get detached from it and there will appear within you the Lord's Grace even as the cool shade in an oasis for a man who has walked the sandy dessert

under the burning sun. Now, to remain steadfast under the shade of the Lord's feet without being distracted by the world, meditate on the sacred letters five as enjoined. 22

Now I have only to point out that when Lord Krishna said,

"Some by meditation behold the Self (the paramatman) in the self by the Self (the Grace of the paramatman" Gita—18, 25. he meant only what is given by the first Part of the above sutra, and that the form of Sri Panchakshara referred to is Sivaya, as the principles of *mala* and *pasa Jnana* must be left out.

These three letters (si, va, ya convey the same meaning as the Mahavakyas. The letter (si) expresses the meaning of the word (That), the letter (ya) expresses the meaning of the word (Thou), and the letter (ya) is expressive of the same meaning as the word (art) in the Mahavakya.

Now, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, it only remains for me to express my heartfelt thanks to one and all of you for the patient hearing you have given me. It is not my intention to carry conviction on each and every point that I gave expression to in my lectures, but my desire is only to draw your attention to a system of philosophy that has its own specific interpretation to offer to Vedanta and to make you interested in the study of that system. If at least some of you have been influenced by my lectures to take to the study of Saiva Siddhānta, I think that my mission has been amply fulfilled. I thank the learned Professors who have presided over the meetings and conducted them in an atmosphere of friendly co-operation and exchange of ideas and the University authorities that have arranged the meetings so as to suit the convenience of all.

I express my deep debt of gratitude to the donor of this lectureship who by endowing this and such other lectureships is serving the cause of true religion and learning. I also thank the authorities of the Annamalai University for having nominated me as the lecturer this year. Once again I thank one and all of you.

THE NATURE OF THE SELF IN THE LIGHT OF SAIVA SIDDHANTA

(Lecture delivered on 22-11-52, at Allahabad University, with Professor A. C. Mukerji, M. A, Head of the Philosophy department of the University in the chair)

(Some by meditation behold the Self in the self by the Self)
(—Bhagavad-gita-18-25)

" ஒரும்வே தாந்தமென் றுச்சியிற் பழுத்த
ஆரா வின்ப அருங்கனி பிழிந்து
சாரங் கொண்ட சைவசித் தாந்தத்
தேனமு தருந்தினர் சிலரே "

(It is only very few that have experienced the ambrosia-like sweet essence, Saiva Siddhanta, of the fruit ripened at the top, Vedanta, of the tree of veda)—Saint Kumara Guruparar.

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,

It gives me very great pleasure to be in your midst this evening and have a talk with you on the principles of Saiva Siddhanta. In our parts of the country, Saiva Siddhanta is the most popular and the most influential of all the various phases of the Hindu religious philosophy. In fact, it is the very core of the cultural and religious life in South India and it is the golden string that runs through every branch of Tamil literature and art. We, the saivites of the

south, also hold that the principles of this phase of philosophy are the very essence of all that can be described as best in the ancient Sanskrit lore. Hence I feel it a unique privilege afforded me to address you on this subject. Let me first of all thank His Holiness Sri la sri Arulnandi Tambiran Swamigal of the Khasi mutt to whose benevolent, thoughtful and wise endowment I owe this unique opportunity.

In Saiva Siddhanta, three eternal, real categories are recognized, maintained and studied. They are (1) *Pati*, the supreme being, (2) *Pasu*, the countless individual conscious selves which are in bondage, and (3) *Pasa*, the bondage. Of the three categories, the middle one, *pasu*, merits our foremost and careful attention in as much as it is the knower of the other two. The individual self is the person who studies the categories; so, without understanding correctly his own true nature, how can he hope to understand the true nature of the two others? [30]

Let us start with our empirical knowledge of self and then try to examine its nature more closely with exactness. Psychologists use a term, *mind*, to contradistinguish our mental life from our physical one. What do they say about the mind? 'Mind is analysed into *feelings*, *will* and *intellect*. These are a trinity in unity. They are characteristic in their several manifestations and yet they are so dependent among themselves that no one can subsist alone. Neither *will* nor *intellect* can be present in the absence of feeling and feeling manifested in its completeness carries with it the germ of the other two. The ultimate analysis of a feeling is either a pleasure or a pain, and so volition or thought cannot in any sense be confounded with feeling. Without the acquisition of feelings, no volition or thought could arise first, and feelings are primarily derived through the sensory organs and centres.'

Now in this analysis, it must be noted, no distinction is drawn between a feeling and a consciousness of it, a volition and a consciousness of it, a reasoning and the consciousness of it. But in Hindu Philosophy, they are distinguished. A mere feeling or willing or thinking is separated from the consciousness of such functions, and the pure consciousness is taken as the *self* or the *conscious ego*. The rest are classed with the body and the world as *nonself*. That is, *self is what lies at the basis of one's mental life*, or *it is the consciousness of its own manifestation*. or, in other words *its distinguishing feature is self-consciousness*. This, then, is our working knowledge or empirical idea of self- It is in keeping with the expression *atman* used to denot it. The Sanskrit word (*atman*) means *self* and it may be mentioned here that the famous Sivajnana swamigal, the commentator of *Sivajnana bodha sutras* speaks of *Atma chaitanya* as that *which stands for 'I' in all our reflective knowledge such as 'I see the book'* (நான் என்னும் உணர்வுக்கு விடயமாகிய ஆன்மசைதன்னியம்).

Before I proceed further, I wish to say a few words about the tiny but great Tamil work called '*Sivajnana Bodham*', which has swayed, for the past seven hundred years or so, and is still swaying the minds of philosophic thinkers and mystics of the South, guiding them in the understanding of the theory, practice and ideal of true religious life. The magnificent Tamil work, *Siva Jnana Siddhiyar*, to the spread of whose message this laudable lectureship has been Instituted, is an elaborate and comprehensive commentary in verses on its primary, *Sivajnana Bodham*. *Sivajnana Bodham* is in the form of 12 sutras of *41 lines in all*. Each sutra formulates a fundamental philosophic truth from the point of view of Saiva Siddhanta, and the formulation is such as to imply two or more vital issues, arising from the

stand point of the other schools of thoughts, and the final decisions on them. Each of these issues forms the basis for a separate discussion and the discussion or dissertation that centres on a particular issue is called *Adhikarna.* There are on the whole *39 adhikarnas*, and they include the world of philosophic thought in them. The Sutras and their adhikarnas are arranged and organized so as to follow one another in a logical sequence, just like standard propositions in a treatise on Demonstrative Geometry. The work, the shortest of all the religious or philosophic treatises now extant in the world, is a complete, organized whole, and it represents the quintessence of the mystic experience of the Hindu saints and seers. By relating philosophy and mystic experience to life, it furnishes a logical foundation for true religious practice. Now it is this work and its secondary Sivajnana Siddhiar that are mainly to guide us in our quest after the true nature of the Individual self.

The proof for existence and the relative and absolute characteristics (*pramana* and *tatashta* and *svarupa lakshanas)* of the individual self are respectively given in the third, fourth and seventh sutras. Of these, the third sutra may be traslated as follows:—

"Since you say that self is nonexistent, since you feel and say that the physical body is yours, since you experience all the five sensations , since you recollect but confusedly your dream experiences, since you have neither experience nor movement in sleep, since you do know but being caused to know, there exists a *self* in the machine-like body, constituted by the products of maya"[31].

The sutra formulates a disjunctive proposition involving seven points at issue and indicates reasons for the refutation

or rejection of the prima facie claims in all of them. The rejected alternatives are (1) that self is nonexistent, (2) that it is none other than the physical body, (3) that it is only the five sense organs, (4) that it is the subtle body (sukshma sarira), (5) that it is the prana vayu (the respiratory organ or its centre), (6) that it is Para Brahman, and (7) that it is the physical and psychical equipment of the body viewed as a whole. There is one more alternative which has a prima facie claim for consideration, viz, that the self is none other than the *antahka ranas*, that is the internal faculties of mind, intellect etc., and this is taken as an issue, considered and refuted in the next sutra.

Now, it is neither possible nor desirable at this hour that I should go deep into all the points mentioned above But as the discussion centring on the first issue implies in a way the essence of the sutra, I shall deal with it briefly :

The proposition is stated in a paradoxical form, viz., 'This self exists since you say, 'no.'—உளது இலதென் றலின் ஆன்மா.

The explanation is as follows :— Those that deny the existence of the self will do so only after some thought or reflection. They will examine whether the body is the self, or whether the five sense organs are the self or whether the internal faculties are the self and so on., until at last they determine that there is no self, as none of these things could be identified as the self. Now in this process of thought, there is an intelligent principle that determines, that forms the final conclusion, and makes the assertion that there is no self. The existence of this intelligent principle cannot be denied and this shall be known to be the self. A denial of this intelligent principle is like one saying that one's mother is a sterile woman.

Now let us go a little deeper into the question:—We have the following experience : I feel and say, 'I am a tall man ; I went to Benares; I do this; and so on.' In these cases, it is only the physical body that is represented by 'I'. At the same time, I have the experience, and, consequently, am led to say, 'This is *my* body. In this case, ' I ' am something other than the body. The body is an object possessed by me. Similarly, when I perceive an object, I am one with the sense organ concerned. But suppose I see a mango, go near it, smell it, and finally taste of it. The reflective knowledge of this direct experience is of the form' I saw the fruit, then touched it, and then smelt it, and finally ate of it and found it very sweet.' In this case, the 'I' cannot denote the individual sense organs or even the various sensory centres of the brain, for one organ cannot do the function of the other, nor one centre cause the sensation caused by the other, Eye can see but can not feel or smell or taste ; nose can smell ; but it cannot see or feel or taste, and so on. But the content of the reflective knowledge is that all these experiences or sensations have occurred *to ME*, the same subject denoted by 'I'. Hence, this subjective reflection or introspection leads us to see that we, the conscious selves, see with (or through) the eye, smell with the nose, hear with the ear and taste with the tongue. Hence we are different from the sense organs or even the different brain centres. But still we identify ourselves with the physical and psychical adjuncts that form part of our existence here. Hence Sri Meykandar, the author of Sivajnana bodham, speaks to us thus in his explanatory note to the first adhikarna of the third sutra : 'There is some thing that identifies itself with the body, sense organs and others that go to constitute your physical and mental life ; and this something, when you begin to know yourself, separates itself from them and remains in the form of Sukshma panchakshara or vyashti

pranava. Know it to be yourself. The physical body, the sense organs and others are adjuncts that aid you to have sense perceptions and experiences, even as the lens prescribed by the doctor aids the defective eye to see things. So you are not one of them, i.e., you are not maya or its evolved products. Nor are you the Para Brahman, for it is *Tutpara,* i,e., it is an intelligent principle (chaitanya) that transcends the realm of maya having no need of it for its manifestation as you do'.

It must be pointed out, in this connection, that the term *maya* is used in this school of thought exactly in the same sense in which it occurs in the *Svetasvatara upanishat.* It is used to denote the substratum of all the material world or the primordial cause of matter and all its products. It is not used in the sense of deceptive phenomenon. Meykandar holds that from sheer emptiness no phenomenon of any real kind can take its rise (இல்லதற்குத் தோற்றமின்மையின் உலகு உள்ளது), and the reality of the phenomenal world, according to him-mark the word, *reality* not *permanence*- consists in the consistency of the practical consequences of an object i.e. the sensations, immediate or remote, we are conceivably to expect from it, and the conduct we have to prepare with respect to it.

Before I leave the consideration of the content of this sutra, I wish to observe that the propositions, two to six, with the reasons indicated in them as deciding factors, are related respectively to the five states of consciousness, viz, the waking state, the dreaming state, the state of sleep in which we have a vague awareness of a kind of pleasure and the duration of the state, the state of sound sleep in which there is no such awareness, and the state when even the respiration is in suspension. These states are respectively called *Jagrata, Swapna, Sushupti, Turiya.* and *Tuiiyatita.*

The conclusions arrived at in the adhikarnas two to six are based on the happenings in these five states respectively and these states are common experiences of daily occurence to everybody. The cause for these different states in our consciousness is discussed in the fourth sutra.

Another point I wish to observe here is that in this school of thought two intelligent principles, differing in their essential characteristics, are recognized and maintained corresponding to the two birds in the same tree, mentioned in the Rgveda and in the Mundakopanishat. One is the Supreme Being (*Siva chaitanyam*) and the other is the individual self (*atma chaitanyam*). The word *Atma* is used in the upanishads to refer to both of them. Hence the sixth adhikarana refutes the theory that maintains that both are identical. According to the theory of the Brahma vadins, there is only one intelligent principle, for a recognition of two intelligent principles is attended with the fallacy of excessiveness (*Gaurava dosha*). This objection is overruled for the following reasons by Meykandar : Parabrahman is self luminous and its consciousness-force or intelligence is unhindered and unclouded. But in the case of the individual selves, their consciousness is clouded and hindered. In the fifth state, *turiyatita*, the conscious self is in complete darkness and in other states it is enlightened by the activity of the adjuncts, physical and psychical, that constitute its body, to a limited extent. This noncognition and the limited enlightenment cannot be attributed to the Para Brahman which is ever luminous. But if it is said that Para brahman is bound by avidya and hence it has the need of the adjuncts for the manifestation of its consciousness, the reply is that it is no Parabrahman ; and even if it is held to be Parabrahman, it is in need of the help of another Parabrahman which has no such blemishes. It is also pointed out that

the individual self even when in conjunction with the active principles of the *tattvas* does not cognize things uniformly. While cognizing one thing, it forgets all others ; while re-cognizing a thing it fails to recall exactly the previous cognition. These defects can never be attributed to the Parabrahman. In short, the individual self is ever in need of a lighter (*vyanjaka*) for its cognition. To perceive objects it is in need of the sense organs ; to know the worldly things in their proper relation to it and to know the contents of the scriptures it requires a preceptor. To have self realization it is in dire need of scripture and a spiritual master. Hence such a self that knows but being caused and helped to know cannot be the same as the Parabrahman that is conscious correctly of all things at all times uniformly without any need of lighters.

The oft quoted text from Brahadaranyaka viz.. (By what can he know that by which he knows all this ?) only reinforces the idea of the existence of two different intelligent principles, for the question pre-supposes the existence of the individual self that knows all this, being caused to know, and the Supreme Self that induces the former to know and transcends the realm of its objective consciousness. The answer to the question is that he knows through the grace or consciousness-force of the supreme and this answer is found in the quotation from the Bhagavad-gita given at the beginning of this lecture.

Now let us go to the fourth sutra, which leads us into a closer and more detailed study of our mental life, its nature and constitution, and thus brings us nearer to the real nature of the *self*. The sutra may be translated thus :—

'The self is not one of the internal organs (antahkaranas), but still as it lost its power of cognition, being shrouded in the inherent dirt (*sahaja mala)*, it associated with

them. In conjunction with them, like a king who is advised by his ministers, it is subject to changing conditions, viz., the five states of consciousness.'

The internal organs referred to in the sutra are four in number. They are *Manas, Buddhi*, *Ahankara*, and *Chitta* (mind, intellect, will and thought).We conceive of these elements or faculties as having certain characteristic functions or manifestations. *Manas* considers, doubts and conceives ; *buddhi* determines or judges ; *ahankara* wills ; *chitta* thinks and retains. These functions or manifestations are objective in nature, i.e., they are directed towards the external objects. So the internal organs are said to be *Paraprakasa*, expressive objectively ; they are not *svaprakasa*, expressive subjectively, i.e., they do not and cannot reflect subjectively. But as the self is *svaprakasa* as well as *paraprakasa*, it cannot be taken to be one of them. It is an entity different from them. The mind or *manas* considers, but does not think that it considers ; the intellect or *buddhi* judges a certain sense-perception to be such and such, but it does not reflect that it judges ; the will or *ahankara* wills, but it does not think that it wills ; and so on. In the case of the self, it is self-conscious, it reflects that it cognizes, wills, judges and so on. Hence the first part of the sutra states that the self is not one of the internal organs.

Here let me briefly indicate how Saiva Siddhanta analyses the psychological process that occurs in the case of sense perception and conception of things. Perception or pratyaksha may be analysed into three parts, sense perception, mental perception and experience. These are termed in Sanskrit *Indriyapratyaksha*, *manasa pratyaksha* and *svavedana pratyaksha* respectively. When we perceive a person or an object through one of the senses, what happens is a particular stimulus impresses our mind and the mind

reacts. The impression is received by *chitta*, a part of the mind. Our first reaction is to be aware of the existence of the external object. *This reaction* or *the interpretatian of impression* in the form, *Here is the object*, without any discrimination or differentiation as to the nature of the object, *is the sense—perception* or *Indriya pratyaksha.* The knowledge acquired of the object is only an undifferentiated whole, without the details being cognized. Hence this is also called *Nirvikalpa pratyaksha* i.e., undiscriminated perception. Hereafter a chain of psychological processes starts. Chitta, which has received the impression, retains it and enquires what it is i.e., tries to relate it to the ideas or mental images or concepts that have been already formed and stored up in the mind. Now the *manas*, another form or modification of the mind, takes it up and does *sankalpa* or *vikalpa*, i.e., equates it to all possible concepts, and ends in doubt. Then *ahankara* comes into play ; it wills to determine the real identity of the object. Sometimes this will power is weak and the sense-perception ends there, without affecting the self. If the will-power is strong, *buddhi* or intellect acts, and judges (or determines) the object to be such and such. The judgement is of the nature of a predication with respect to the object perceived by means of sense-perception. [32] The object may be predicated with respect to (1) its name, (2) its species, (3) its quality, (4) its movement or (5) anything that may be an adjunct to it. The illustrations for these various forms are respectively (1) This is Atreya, (2) He is an Indian, (3) He is tall, (4) He walks away from me and (5) He has a book. In these cases, the object is perceived with discrimination ; we discriminate the object from others by means of the five attributes mentioned above. The content of the knowledge has the object and the attributes differentiated. Hence this perception is called

Savikalpa pratyaksha. The process is wholly mental ; it starts from the reaction of *chitta* (a form of manas itself) and ends with the reaction of the *buddhi.* Hence the perception is termed *manasa pratyaksha* or mental perception. Note that sense perception and nirvikalpa pratyaksha are one and the same ; and the mental perception and savikalpa pratyaksha are one and the same.

Here, in explaining the nature of these two perceptions, I am thinking aloud and using words so that they may fall on your ears, reach your minds and produce the same thoughts there as arise in my mind. My words carry my thoughts and convey them to your minds, for we think in words. But we do not live in them. In actual perception, besides these manifestations, something more happens. As the internal organ *buddhi* grasps the characteristics of the stimulus that has come from an external object and determines it, a change comes about it. It becomes modified. The modification corresponds to the particular manifestation of the object at the time of perception. According to Hindu philosophy all things are of the forms of the three qualities, *satva, rajas* and *tamas,* or, in other words, these three qualities are the constituents of everything and they are the causes respectively of harmony or purity, great activity or disharmony, and inactivity or darkness in them. At a given time one of these will be predominant while the others remain in a subdued form in a particular thing. So *buddhi,* while judging or determining a particular object to be of a particular nature, becomes modified into that quality (or guna) which is predominant in that object. And the buddhi, thus modified into satva or rajas or tamas according to the circumstances, is contacted by the *purusha,* the individual self, and the result is that the individual self has the experience of pleasure, pain or gloom respectively. This experience,

which is only a form of direct perception or cognition by the individual self of the modified buddhi, is called the *svavedana pratyaksha.* Hence it will be clear now how the individual self is affected by external objects through the senses and internal organs and is subject to the worldly experience which may be broadly classified under pleasure, pain and gloom or insensibility. The whole process starts from the external object giving rise to sense perception and mental perception in succession, and ends with experience or Svavedana pratyaksha. Sri Meykandar compares this process to the rising of waves in succession, one causing the rise of the next one and the final one reaching the shore or the bank. Here we must understand that purusha or the individual self is different from the internal organs, even as the internal organs are different from the sense organs and the sense organs from the external objects. [33]

At this stage, a very interesting information is furnished by this school of thought. As I referred to already, we think in words. The words need not be uttered. Whenever we utter words, our intention is to convey our thoughts to others. This form of speech is called *Vaikari vak* or the gross form of speech. There are sublter forms. When we see an object, an image of it is formed in our mind : this is an idea. But when we know a particular object to be such and such, the mental process may be called *ideation,* [35] This *ideation* is always in language form and without this ideation no *savikalpa Jnana* is possible. So *vak* or speech in its various conditions (five viz., *ati Sukshma, Sukshma, pashyanti, madhyama* and *vaikari)* is at the root of our *savikalpagnana.* So it is said that these *vaks* in the form of the *pranava kalas* induce or impel the internal organs or faculties and enable us to have *savikalpa pratyaksha.* Thus the letter (a) impels ahankara, (u) imples buddhi, (m) impels manas, *bindu* impels

chitta and *nada* impels purusha. *Nada* is the cosmic stress or impulse, *bindu* is the wavy motion that is generated, and the letters *a, u, m* are respectively the plan, process and perfection (i.e., origin, sustenance and end) of the world of speech or ideation. These five kalas in their integrated form become *O M.* It is in the form of these five *kalas* that the individual self is recognized by means of introspection. Sri Meykandar already indicated this in the first adhikarana of the third sutra.[35]

So far we have been led by means of a subjective study of our own existence to recognize or realise our *self* to be the self-conscious principle in us.

The five kalas referred to above with respect to our life, viz., *nada, bindu,* (m), (u) and (a) are each successively the effected form of its immediate predecessor and are also the forms respectively of the five *vaks,* viz., *para* (or atisukshma), *Sukshma, pashyanti, maddhyama and vaikari.* In their integrated form they become (om), pranava, the primary cause of the whole world of speech. The five kalas are meditated on by siva yogins in the form of *prasadas,* twelve or sixteen in number. *Ajapa* is only a modification of pranava and it controls pranavayu (or respiration) by alternately holding it and releasing it. When the *prana vayu* is held up, we think or cognize, and when released, we sink into forgetfulness. Thus we have every moment cogitation and forgetfulness alternating due to the action of *ajapa.* It is said that at the root of all our action, physical or mental, there is the impelling force of the five pranava kalas mentioned above and they form the most powerful bondage to us and it is most difficult for us to disengage from them and realize our true nature as distinguished from them. One who does so attains paramoksha.

The five conditions or states of our consciousness are due to our contact with the organs, both external and internal, and separation from one or more of them or all of them.

Now the question naturally arises, why such a self which is self-conscious and objective conscious (i. e., svaprakasa and paraprakasa) should seek the aid of the internal organs, or why should it cognize and experience the worldly objects only in conjunction with the internal organs which are different from it? There is also another question, why should such an atman, which is *Vibhu* (all pervasive), as the word *atman* itself means, be conditioned or limited to the organism and subject to the changes as indicated in the various states of consciousness, waking, dreaming, sleeping etc. The answer is that it is enshrouded in mala or spiritual darkness which hides its consciousness completely. Now that the inherent impurity or mala hides or screens the self's consciousness-force (atma chit-shakti or the dharma bhuta jnana of the self, to use the term used by Sri Ramanuja), the self fails to cognize things without being in conjunction with the products of maya viz., the organism and the external and internal organs. For the same reason, the individual self is subject to five states of consciousness.

All schools of philosophic thought seem to recognise in one way or other the effcct of this evil principle or spiritual darkness which exercises a deadening and tempting power on the conscious self and limits it and makes it finite. But they attribute the effects to various other causes such as maya, absence of jnana, avidya, and so on. Saiva Siddhanta distinguishes the evil principle from all those things, and postulates its existence as a separate entity. It is not possible for me to enter into a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the subject. But I wish to point out that it is not

maya or any of its products. *Maya*, far from darkening our consciousness, enlightens it, for is it not a matter of common experience that we are gaining knowledge, dispelling our ignorance by degrees, by our contact and interaction with the worldly objects through the organism ? Meykandar says, "But for our life in the organism (with all its physical and psychical equipments) of maya, which like the lamp-light serves to enlighten the understanding of the self, the self can know nothing, for just as a piece of wood hides heat energy within itself in such a way that heat becomes indistinguishable from it and seems nonexistent, so the evil principle envelops the self from eternity in such a way that it becomes indistinguishable from it."[36] The philosophic principles that are being expounded now are not the outcome of of fanciful theories or the intellectual feats of mediaeval theology. Of course they are founded on scripture. But still they are mostly easily deducible from common observation of life.

Independently of the form of life that is going on in intimate union with the organic body and all its organs, external and internal, on this earth amidst all its objects, the self cannot awaken to its own reality, nor can it attain to a knowledge of itself and its environment, nor can it escape from the trammels of ignorance, evil and sin. The conscious self is neither maya, nor any of their products, nor even a function of them. But still it is in an intimate union with the products of maya. Why this intimacy between the two is thus explained from a practical point of view, showing the purpose of the intimacy to be entightenment to the individual self which lies immersed in mental gloom. Observe the life of an individual from the time of his birth. At the time of its birth the child practically knows nothing ; it only feels the pinch of hunger and cries. The mother nurses it, and it goes to sleep. But the child is not allowed

to sleep away all the time. Soon hunger and thirst tap the child and bring it back to consciousness and activity. Thus as time passes, the child grows not only physically but mentally and spiritually also and gets to know more and more of the environment and of its own phsyical and mental nature. So, by observation and reasoning, we may Postulate three principles coexisting in inseparable union. One is the individual mind or the conscious self, the other a darkening, deadening and limiting cause, and the third the organism with all the complexity. These are then the *pasu* (the conscious ego), *malam* (egoism or *pasuttvam*) and *maya* respectively. Here it must be observed that ignorance is an undeniable factor in the constitution of our mental life, it is not our prevailing condition, for side by side there is our intelligence aspiring to overcome it with the assistance of *maya* under the guidance of the Supreme Intelligence.

Even as the external force is what is at the root of all changes in motion of the objects, so also the Consciousness-Force (the chit shakti of the Supreme Being) is at the root of the changing conditions of the states of consciousness. The individual selves are in bondage, being under the deadening and limiting influence of the *Sahaja Mala* ; so they cannot by themselves, for the sake of setting themselves free from its influence, create and get the organism and the surroundings. Nor can *maya*, being devoid of intelligence and the consequent voluntary movements, plan, originate, execute and give them to the selves. All original movements must have been produced from an intelligent cause. Hence a Supreme Being of ever resplendent intelligence follows. Supreme Being creates or moulds the organism, the organs of it, the world and its objects *(Tanu, Karana, bhuvana, bhoga)* from *maya* according to the nature of the karma of the individual selves. Hence *maya* is the first or the

substantial cause of the cosmic creation ; the Consciousness-Force of the Supreme Being and the karma of the selves directed by it are the instrumental cause; and the Supreme Being is the efficient cause. *Maya* being insentient can reap no benefit from its evolution and the Supreme Being has no need for any benefit as it is perfect. So, by elimination, it follows that the beneficiary is the individual conscious self, the purpose of the cosmic creation being the emancipation of the self from the fetters of the spititual darkness called the *sahaja mala.* To bring home to our mind the logical need of these distinct principles for a correct and full interpretation of creation, the familiar analogy of a potter, the mud, his instrument and men who use the pots is generally given. Here, too, Saiva Siddhanta carefully distinguishes between the workings of a known efficient cause and an unknown efficient cause. The known efficient cause, the potter, sits apart from the material cause, mud, with his instruments of wheel and stick, and shapes the pot. But the Supreme, the invisible efficient cause, remains in intimate union with the substantial cause and the creation, within and without, motivating or inducing them to movement and action with His unconquerable and unfettered will power, which is called His *chit shakti* or Consciousness-Force. He is immanent and omnipresent in all, both sentient and insentient, while yet being distinct from them by virtue of his innate pristine qualities. This relation of Him with His creation and His beneficiaries is denoted by the word '*advaitam*' in the upanishads. The term *advaitam* or *advitiyam* signifies *union* not *unity,* inseparable togetherness as between the mover and the moved (*preraka prerebya* or *Niyamaka niyamya relation*) and not identity. The term '*advaita*' used in Chandogya and in others cannot be taken to mean one or unity for the following reasons :—

i. If it is taken to mean one, the very mention of it implies another principle that signifies as one, for one need not think or signify oneself as one. ii. The prefix 'Na' before a numeral is used only in the sense of *samya* or *sadrisya*, as in *aneka*, not in the sense of *abhava* (complete absence) or others. iii. In lhe expression '*Ekamevadvitiyam* there are two words '*Ekam*' and '*advitiyam*', and if the word '*advitiyam*' also means '*Ekam*', then it makes the expression faulty by introducing redundancy, which the author would not at all have thought of introducing. iv. The meaning ONE when attribuuted to *advitiyam* in no way helps the interpretation of the *Mahavakya* and so on.[37] The correct interpretation of the text is as follows :— The term 'Ekam' means one, no doubt. It signifies the unity of Godhead. Thou that understandest thus when pointed out and shown art *pasu* (the bound self). Thou art bound and fettered by *pasa* (ties viz., *Mula mala*, *maya* and *Karma)* and so art called *pasu*.[38]

Thou art finite, subject to births and deaths, misery and happiness, and all the opposites of the world. The Para-Brahman that is one is infinite and it remains untouched by them. Now as this Para-Brahman is immanent in all beings and is all pervasive, it is *advitiyam*, i. e., is in inseparable union with all. In order that we may understand this immanence or all pervasiveness of the Supreme, we have to conceive it as two in one viz., *shiva* when thought of as self-luminous in Himself; and *shakti*, when thought of as pervading all in inseparable togetherness. *Shakti* is the consciousness-force (consciousness as force) of the Supreme Being and it is its quality and *svarupa*. The *chit shakti* or the consciousness-force of the Supreme Being is also called grace (திருவருள்), for shakti is nothing but overwhelming love of the Lord that flows towards the

individual selves to emancipate them and enable them to have supreme bliss that is His.

The sense organs objectify their respective objects being impelled by the self's power of cognition ; but they cannot objectify the self. In the same way, the individual self perceives and objectifies things being impelled by the Supreme being, but, as it is under the influence of mala, it cannot leave its egoism and turn inward and perceive the Supreme, the source and the mainstay of its enlightenment Egoism, which is the result of the self's conjunction with *mula mala*, turns the consciousness-force of the self objectward and the self has the three kinds of perception, as said ; before, and has the experience of pleasures and pains ; *Karma* is the substantial cause of the wordly pleasures and and pains ; it causes the pleasures and pains. The products of *maya*, in the form of the organism, the organs in it, the world and the wordly objects, are instrumental in causing the experience. The *sahajamala* or *anava* in the form of egoism and egoistic tendencies is the efficient factor for the wordly experience. Hence *anavamala* is called *mulamala* for it is at the root of all the miseries. The other principles viz , *maya* and *karma* are only indirectly responsible for the self's bondage in the world. So all the three, *anava*, *maya* and *karma* are called collectively *pasa*. Of these three, *anava* is the inherent one to the self, as the husk to the rice and the verdigris to copper. Hence it is called *sahajamala ;* the other two are associated with the conscious self by the Supreme Self, so that it may get free from the clutches of *anava* and gain its full pristine spiritual stature. The influence of *maya* and karma on *anava* is a softening one, and so the power of *anava* gets weakened gradually. Hence the latter two, *maya* and *karma*, are called *agandukamalas* (those that have come later). The grace or the

consciousness-force of the Supreme Being, which thus connectes the individual selves and the world of pleasures and pains, and works through the malas is called, in this respect and to this extent, *Tirodana shakti*) the power or force that hides). But all that it does is only for the good of the selves, is only a preparation of the individual selves for the reception of the Endless Bliss called *Bhuma* in the upanishads.

In Saiva Siddhanta, a distinction is made between false-knowledge (or agnana) as fallacious or illusory knowledge, and false knowledge as the effect of some defect in the instrument or organ of knowledge itself. When we mistake a rope for snake, the fallacious or illusory knowledge is due to some incidental cause such as distance, the form of the rope, want of sufficient light and so on. It is not due to any inherent defect in the eye itself. Illusory knowledge will yield giving place to the true knowledge on closer observation. But if a man is sufferring from excessive bile, sugar, which he knows by all means to be sweet, will persist to taste bitter unless and until the disease is diagnosed, and effective means adopted for its remedy. The false knowledge of our own self, that we are finite, and of our own consciousness, that it assumes various shapes while forming mental images, etc., is due to the inherent mala as in the latter case. So we cannot get rid of it by mere enquiry of the true nature of the *atman* ; it will be as effectless as one's trying to satisfy one's hunger by simply being entertained to or partaking of Barmecide feast. The inherent *mala*, the real cause at the root, must be removed. And it is being done by the lord's *Tirodana sakti* by adding two more *malas* to the original one, even as a washerman adds washing soda or the like to a cloth with a view to remove its original dirt. At the exact time when the original dirt of the cloth softens and loosens, the cloth will be dipped in pure water and then it

will become cleansed of all the dirts. So also at the time when the inherent *maḷa* completely loosens its hold on the conscious self, the Lord who has been impelling it, as the Self of the self, watching and guiding, appears, in His infinite love and mercy, as the spiritual master and bathes the conscious self in His Light of Grace and cleanses it of all the malas. The index for this spiritual maturity is tranquil and equable state of mind, when neither pleasure induces liking nor pain hate.[39] True and disinterested worship of the Lord, both external and internal attended by a strict adherence to a code of virtuous life as God ordained, alone will lead to this state of mind, and it is only that state of mind that is capable of receiving *siddhanta jnana*, which consists in a realization of the true and absolute nature of the conscious self as against the relative knowledge of it which has been dealt with till now.

As I have already indicated, the 7th sutra expresses the true nature of the conscious self with respect to its state of release. In the words of Sri Meykandar, 'The conscious self which is neither nature (asat) nor Para-Brahaman (sat) has the cognition of both' (இருதிறனறிவுளது இரண்டலா ஆன்மா).

The Tamil phrase, 'இருதிறன் அறிவு' is expressive of objective, instrumental and local relation of the noun denoting *asat* and *sat* with respect to the cognition of the conscious self, and thus it throws a flood of light on the nature of the cognition of the individual self. Now I shall leave all the learned technicalities and try to give the plain meaning intended.

The conscious self is neither the one nor the other of the two principles, viz ; *asat* and *sat*, i.e., *nature*, whose experience it is having now, and *parabrahaman* or *sivam*,

whose experience it seeks to attain. And it is said that it is capable of experience of *sat* as well as *asat*, and so all the conditions that attend the experience of *asat* can be transferred *mutatis mutandis* to the experience of *shiva* in order to have an idea of the spiritual experience ; for we have to proceed from the known to the unknown.

Now the remarkable fact with reference to the worldly experience or the cognition of *asat* is that the conscious self has the experience always through a medium ; it does not see things per se, but through a means or an organ. For example, we see things with the eyes. hear with the ear, think with the mind. In other words, we are affected by and are conscious of nature only through certain means or instruments, and these instruments are also of the category of the world of nature. Now we may recollect how, in the case of sense perception, the external sense organs have been the instruments and how in the case of mental perception the internal organs called *antahkaranas* have been instruments. In the case of inferential knowledge, the perception of the antecedent (hetu) with a knowledge of the invariable con-comitance of its consequent is instrumental, and in the case of scriptural knowledge scripture is instrumental. In the case of experience or *svavedana pratyaksha*, the object of perception is the antahkarana, *buddhi*, as modified. So there should be an instrument which is more closely connected with the conscious self ; and this is '*vidya*' which is one of the five tattvas that form an enlightening cover *(vijnana maya kosha)* to the conscious self, which is also spoken as *Kanchuka sarira*.

These five and two others are mentioned in the second mantra of the Svetasvatara. The seven tattvas mentioned there are, in the terminology of this system, *maya (karya maya)*, *kala*, (time), *niyati* (that which regulates the karma

of a person), *kala*, *vidya*, *raga* and *purusha*. According to this school of thought, the element *maya* referred to here is the *anandamaya kosha* of the *Taitriya upanishad*, and the group of the next five is the *vignana maya kosha*, the *sukshma sarira* is the *pranamaya kosha* and the physical body is the *annamaya kosa* I have mentioned these things, by the way, just to inform you that Saiva Siddhanta is very closely connected with the upanishadic thought and possibly throws, new light on many of the problems of the upanishadic thought that have baffled great minds.

This conscious self which is clothed in *ananda maya kosha* and *vignanamaya kosha* becomes aware of itself, and has a tendency to objectify or experience the worldly things. In that condition, it is called *purusha* ; and it is the *purusha* that has experience or *svavedana pratyaksha*. Hence our author wishes us to understand that the conscious self which is not *asat* cognizes *asat* with *asat*. There is also another thing which is to be noted. While having experience or *svavedana pratyaksha*, the conscious self indistinguishably merges in the object of experience. In other words, in all cases of experience, the conscious self identifies itself with the object of experience and has its being in it for the nonce. It assumes the colour of the object like a crystal that is in contact with a coloured object, and shines in its colour. It has a local relation with the object which may be described as pervasion in which it loses its individuality and becomes one with the object (அது அதுவாய் வசிப்புண்ணும் வியாபகம்). It is this tendency or characteristic of the conscious self that makes it oblivious of all other objects and of the existence of itself at the time of experience. This characteristic of it also distinguishes it from the Para-Brahman that is never known to be forgetful of anything at any instant and leads the Saiva Siddhantin to give a beautiful definition for experience.

Experience, according to him, is cognitional ingress (அழுந்தி அறிதல்). The sanskrit word anubhava means only a particular kind of cognition in which the conscious self has ingress in the object, i. e., it loses its individuality, identifies itself with the object and becomes one with it, so to say. In short, when the conscious self experiences *asat* (i.e., nature), it does so with *asat* as the organ, and appears in the colour of *asat*.

This is true even in the case of the highest spiritual experience. There it experiences, or cognizes with ingress, *sat*, with *sat* as the organ, and shines in the qualities of *sat*. This is also, in our opinion, what is meant by the sloka of the Bhagavad-gita that prefaces this lecture. In the expression, 'Some behold Atma in atma by Atma,' the object of 'behold' is *paramatma* the *sivasat*. The *atman* in the Phrase '*in atma*' is *paramatma* in his *sakti* aspect i. e., the light of grace or the consciousness-force of the *siva sat* which is both its quality and svaroopa. So the sloka means that 'some by *ananyabhavana* behold *sivasat* in their own *self* with the eye of grace' In the highest state of spiritual experience, the conscious self indistinguishably merges in the Supreme and has its being in it. There it does not see any other thing, does not hear any other thing, does not cognize any other thing as per *Chandogya*. If it does, it means, it has not lost its egoistic tendency, the effect of *mala*, and it loses the Endless Bliss. So it is enjoined on .such a self that it should perform *advaita bhavana* or *ananya bhavana* as indicated by the great expression '*Sivohamasmi*.' It is this *Sivoham bhavana* that is indicated by *dhyanena* in the sloka. Here the predicate 'asmi' in the grand expression does not express identity (*nirupacharita aikya*), but it indicates *upacharita aikya*, *advaita* relation that subsists between the leader and

the led, while the latter completely surrenders his individuality and becomes a mere instrument in the hand of the former.

Now let me sum up the essential points of my lecture: The conscious self is an entity distinct from either *maya* or *Para-Brahaman*. Its nature as a self-conscious being distinguishes it from all things that can be called worldly, and its need always for a medium or organ for the manifestation of its consciousness, of the nature of asat while cognizing '*asat*,' and of the nature of *sat* while cognizing *sat*; and its remarkable tendency to become indistinguishably merged in the object of its experience and shine in its colour distinguishes it from the Para-Brahman. It is, as can be inferred from a subjective study of ourselves, under the influence of three distinct entities; the three being (i) the inherent mala called *anava*, (ii) nature or the products of *maya*, in the form of the organism, the physical and psychical equipments therein, the world and the worldly objects and (iii) the all pervasive Consciousness-Force or the light of grace of the Supreme Being. These three may respectively be compared to an atmosphere of darkness, various lamplights and the supreme splendour of the sun. The conscious self which is influenced by these may be compared to the eye. Even as the eye is one with darkness while in darkness and is one with light while in light, so also the conscious self is one with bondage while in bondage and one with *Siva sat* while in conjunction with *siva sat*, and its nature cannot be perceived as apart from the other two principles.

The conditions of our present state may be compared to a banquet hall at night where there is lighting arrangement. When almost all the lights are switched on, the eye merges in light and sees its objects. In the same way, when almost all the organs of our body are active, the conscious self has

its waking state and objectifies things. Suppose all the lights except a few are switched off ; the eye is in partial darkness. This is our dreaming state : at last when all the lights are off and it is pitch dark, the eye loses its power of perception and remains in complete darkness. This is our *Turiyatita* state when we are completely under the influence of the spiritual darkness. This turiyatita which occurs to us daily is an indication as to our original condition, the point of time of which we are unable to conceive of. So, with our faculty of reason, we may extend our vision backwards with the help of the present, and believe that our original condition should have been one of stupor in which we must have been in complete ignorance and unawareness. This state is called *Kevala* and the cause for this *mula mala* or *anava*. This state, a phase of which we are daily *experiencing* is described as night in the upanishads.

The condition or state when we have objective experience in which case we have the active co-operation of all our physical and psychical adjuncts, is called *Sakala*. The cause for this is *maya*. This is referred to as day time in the upanishads, for here we have *jnana* caused by *maya*, which is one of the elements of *pasa* or bondage. This is called *pasajnana*.

Now suppose there is sun-rise. The darkness will vanish completely and the eye, being under the influence of sun's light, will remain unaffected by lamplights as well as darkness. This is called *Suddha* state or the state of *nirmala* where there is neither *day* nor *night*. In this state the conscious self is unaffected by either *anava* or *maya* and *karma*, and is enveloped in the light of grace and experiences the supreme bliss which is the very essence of *siva sat* or *Para-Brahman*. The cause for this *Siva sakti* or the light of grace, in whose splendour the

spiritual darkness loses all its power and the *maya* becomes transformed into something of the nature of Divine Grace. This is what we hope our future, everlasting condition would be, by vision combined with reasoning.

These states are basic and are called *karana avasthas*. In actual experience there are no hard and fast line of demarcation between any two of these. So to make us understand these to a fuller extent, the shastras divide each into five gradations and they are called *karya avasthas*.

From the above we are led to conclude that it is *Siva Sat* that is rendering all help to us, remaining as the Self of our selves, both in the state of bondage and in the state of release, and that we are in eternal dependence on His Grace. It is for us to realize that kindly light and be led by it. This is the high road of grace leading to eternal peace and bliss while fulfilling the worldly ideal of social harmony.

"Consciousness, He said, I am ;

The bliss within me, He said, is Shiva ;

What hid from me the nature of both, He said, is Pasa.

Whoever has enquired into these three will get liberated."

GURU JNANA SAMBANDAR,
(the founder Saint of the Dharmapuram Adhinam.)

ADDITIONAL NOTES

(Reference Nos. are those given in the body of Lectures).

LECTURE I—(*Delivered* at *Benares*).

1. *Cf.* "The Saiva Siddhānta system is the most elaborate, influential, and undoubtedly the most intrinsically valuable of all the religions of India. It is peculiarly the South-Indian, and Tamil religion......Saivism is the old prehistoric religion of South India, essentially existing from Pre-Aryan times, and holds sway over the hearts of the Tamil people"—Dr. G. U. Pope, in his English Translation of *Tiruvachakam*, p. lxxiv, (Introduction).

2. "......வேதாந்தத் தெளிவாஞ் சைவ
சித்தாந்தத் திறனிங்குத் தெரிக்கலுற்ரும்"—
—சிவப்பிரகாசம், பாயிரம், 7

3. "...வேதத்
தலைதருபொருளாய்........................
மலைவறும் உணர்வால் பெத்த முத்திகள்
மதித்தாமன்றே"
—ஷை 99.

4. Vide Sivagnānapādiyam, 6th Sutra, Sivasamavāda maruppu—the meaning of *Advaita*, (Pp. 326 to 328).

5. Hear Meykanda Deva : "அத்துவிதம் என்ற சொல் லானே ஏகமெனில், ஏகம் என்று சுட்டுவதுண்மையின், அத்து விதம் என்ற சொல்லே அந்நிய நாத்தியை உணர்த்துமாயிட்டு" -Sivagnāna Bōdham, 2nd Sūtra, 2nd Adhikarana-Vārttikam.

6. Introductory Stanza, Sivagnāna Bōdham.

7, Vide (i) Sivagnāna Siddhiyār, Supaksham, Chapter I, Means of valid knowledge, kinds of perception and (ii) Sivagnāna pādiyam, 2nd Sūtra, 2nd Adhikarana, discourses on *Viddiyātattuvam* (para 5)' *Buddhi tattuvam* (paras) 3, 4, 5, and 6,)

8. Hear Sivagnāna Swamigal : "............—"நன்று சொன்னாய் ! ஆன்மாவின்வேறாகிய மூலப்பகுதியின்கண்ண தாகிய சாத்துவிக குணம் ஆன்மாவின் மாட்டு மேற்பட்டு விளங்குதலே உலகவின்பம் ; அதுவதுவாய் அழுந்திநின்றறிதலே அநுபவமெனப்படுமாகலின், அது போல ஆன்மாவின் வேறாய்ச் சிவன்கண்ணே யுளவாகிய முற்றுணர்தல் முதலிய எண்வகைக் குணங்களும் ஆன் மாவின்மாட்டு மேம்பட்டு விளங்கும் விளக்கமே சிவானந்த வின்பம் ; ஆன்மா அதுவாய் அழுந்தி நின்று அவ்விளக் கத்தை அறிதலே அனுபவமெனப்படும் என்பது எம்மனோர் சிந்தாந்தமாகலின், அதனான் உனக்குப்போந்த தென்னை என்பது."—சிவஞானபாடியம், 6 ஆம் சூத்திரம், 2 ஆம் அதிகரணம், சிவசமவாதமறுப்பு (பக். ௩௩௧)

9. Sivagnāna Bōdham, Seventh Sūttra, Third line.

10. "இனி, இருதிற னறிவுள திரண்டலா வான்மா வென்றது, இவ்விரண்டினையும் அறிவதாய், உபதேசியாய் நின்ற அவ்வறிவு இரண்டன்பாலும் உளதாயுள்ள அதுவே அவ்வான்மாவாம் என்றது"—மெய்கண்டதேவர் வார்த்திகம், சூத்திரம் ௭. அதிகரணம் ௩.

11. *Cf.* "அநாதி முத்த சித்துருவாகிய முதல்வன், ஒன்றினுந் தோய்வின்றித் தானே சொயம்பிரகாசமாய் நிற் குந் தன்னுண்மையிற் சிவமெனவும், உலகெலாமாகி வேறாய் உடனுமாய் இவ்வாறு உயிர்களின் வழி நிற்குந் தன்மையிற் சத்தியெனவும் தாதான்மியத்தான் இருதிறப்பட்டு, பின் ஐந்தொழில் செய்யுந் தன்மையிற் பதியெனப் பெயர் பெற்று நிற்பன் என்னும் சிவாகமநூற்றுணி புணர்த்துவார், இவ்வாறு பகுத்தோதினார்."—சிவஞான சுவாமிகள்—சிவ ஞானசிதித்யார், இரண்டாஞ் சூத்திரம், முதற்பாட்டு, கருத்துரை.

12. Vide Sivagnāna pādiyam, Seventh Sutra, concluding paragraph.

13. Vide Sivagnāna Bōdham, 9th Sütra.

14. " Vide "வியாபகப்பொருளுக்கு ஒருவுதலாவது காட்சி விசேடமே யாமென்பார், அசத்தென்றொழிய என்னுது அசத்தென்று காண என்றும்......உரைத்தார்"—Sivanāna pādiyam, Sūtram 9, Adhikarana 2, commentary on *Vārttikam*.

15. "சொற்பா லமுதிவள் யான்சுவை யென்னத் துணிந்திங்ஙனே
நற்பால் வினைத்தெய்வந் தந்தின்று நானிவ ளாம் பகுதிப்
பொற்பார் அறிவார் புலியூர்ப் புனிதன் பொதியில் வெற்பிற்
கற்பா வியவரை வாய்க்கடி தோட்ட களவகத்தே."
திருக்கோவையார் 7. See its commentary by Pērāsiriyar.

---

16. "Māyāntu Prakritim vidyāt; māyinantu mahēswaram" is the Sruti (Svetāsvatara. 4th Adhyāya, 10th mantra). It means know *māyā* as the *Prakriti* (primordial substance) and Mahēsvarā as *its Lord*. Note the distinction between *prakriti*, the primal basis of the phenomenal world, and *God Head*, the efficient cause that effects and controls the evolution and involution of the world, which the Sruti intends to convey.

17. *Cf* St. 16 of Sivaprakāsam, which is translated by Sri K. Subrahmania Pillai, M.A., M.L. as follows:—"The universe comes into being in forms male, female and sexless. It endures and suffers involution in due process of time. Subsequently it undergoes re-evolution on account of bonds from which souls have to be freed. Forms change, appear, move and disappear. Māyā their primordial basis is by itself motionless and unintelligent. The bound souls have not the intellectual freedom to assume forms of their own accord and yet they are embodied and do their work. So it is the unbound Supreme Being that is the moving cause of all." Page 17, Sivaprakasam—original and English Translation,—Dharmapuram Ādhinam Edition.

18. *Cf.* "அற்ருயினும் முத்தொழில் செய்யும் இறைவன் உருவுடையனுதல் வேண்டும்; உடம்பின்றி வினை செய்தல் கூடாமையின் எனின்,—அற்றன்று; தன்னுடம்பினை இயக்குவதாய வுயிர்க்கு வடிவின்மையின், இறைவனும் அவ்வாறு உருவின்றி நின்றே தன்னுருவமாகிய உலகத்தைத் தொழிற்படுத்துதல் அமையுமென்க. இஃது உணர்ந்து கோடற்கன்றே, "உலகமே யுருவமாக யோனிகள் உறுப்பதாக—இலகுபே ரிச்சா ஞானக் கிரியையுட் கரண மாக-அலகிலா உயிர்ப் புலன்கட் கறிவினை யாக்கி யைந்து—நலமிகு தொழில்க ளோடு நாடக நடிப்பனுதன்" என்ருர் வழிநூலாசிரியர் etc. "Sivagnāna pādiyam, First Sūtra, Second adhiharana.

19. " வித்துண்டா மூல முளைத்தவா தாரகமாம்
அத்தன்ருள் நிற்றல் அவர்வினைவால்
—வித்தகமாம்

... ...

... ...மண்போற் குளிர்ந்து."—

Sivagnāna Bōdham, Vārttikam, St. 1 of the 2nd adhikarana of 1st Sūtra.

20. For a fuller discussion of this point refer to Sivagnāna pādiyam on Vārttikam, first adhikarana of the 2nd sūtra.

21. It will be interesting to note that this slōka which is considered to be an epitome of Saiva-Siddhanta system of thought has its counterpart in the sacred words of St. Tirugnāna Sambandhar in Tamil as follows :—

" விளையாததொர் பரிசில்வரு பசுபாசவே தனையொண்
தளையாயின தவிரவ்வருள் தலைவன் "
—Sacred Book 1, hymn 12. St. 3.

which means, "The Lord who is graciously pleased to extricate the eternally bound self from the bonds of spiritual darkness, the actions, good and evil, which cause sufferings, and the enlightening entanglement of Nature."

22. The thoughts expressed in this and the following paragraphs closely follow those of Stanza 7, (Introductory) of Sivaprakasam and of the first adhikarana—Vārttikam—of the second Sūtra, Sivagnāna Bōdham.

23. This illustration is used by St. Meykandar in the eleventh Sātra, which deals with the State of *Para mukti*, the end of our eternal aspiration. The Sūtra may be translated thus : Even as the self enables the eye to see by itself seeing, so the Supreme leads the self to cognize, by itself cognizing. If the self is actively conscious of this gracious help of the Supreme, rendered by being in *advaita*

relation with it, the self gets irrevocably attached to the supreme and experiences the Supreme Bliss, which is the very reflection of the self's undying love of the Supreme.

24. Compare note 11, Lecture I.

25. For a logical derivation of these qualities refer to *Upōdghātam* to *Periyapurānam* (First para) by Srila Sri Yāzhpānam Arumukha Nāvalar in his edition of Periya-purānam.

26. The Sūtra is :—

" உணருரு அசத்தெனின், உணரா தின்மையின்,
இருதிற னல்லது சிவசத் தாமென
இரண்டு வகையி னிசைக்குமன் னுலகே."

—Sivagnāna Bōdham.

LECTURE III

27. "அன்றன் றெனநின் றனைத்தும்விட் டஞ்செழுத்தாய்
நின்றென் றுளததுவே நீயனைத்து—நின்றின்று
தர்ப்பணம்போற் காட்டலாற் சார்மாயை நீயல்லை
தற்பரமு மல்லை தனி.—Sivagnāna Bōdham, Third

Sūtra, First adhikaranam—*Vārttikam.*

28. For a fuller and comprehensive discussion of the Evil Principle, Mala, rcfer to *Sivagnana Padiyam*, Fourth Sutra, second adhikaranam.

29. "ஊனக்கண் பாச முணராப் பதியை
ஞானக் கண்ணிற் சிந்தை நாடி
யுராத்துனைத் தேர்த்தெனப் பாச மொருவத்
தண்ணிழலாம் பதிவிதி யெண்ணுமஞ் செழித்தே."

LECTURE IV *(Delivered at Allahabad)*

30. *Cf.* (i) "பலகலையா கமவேத மியாவையினுங் கருத்துப்
பதிபசுபா சந்தெரித்தல்."

[It is the object of all great works, the *Āgamas* dealing with multifold sciences, the Vēdas and others, to expound the concepts of *pati*, *pashu* and *pāsham*]-Sivaprakāsam-13.

(ii) "தம்மை யுணர்ந்து தமையுடைய தன்னுணர்வார்
எம்மை யுடைமை யெமையிகழார்."

[Those that realize their own self and then realize the Supreme of which they are eternal servants are the Supreme Being Itself; and I am their servant and they will not find fault with me or with my work]—Sivagnāna Bōdham—*Introductory.*

31. "உளதில தென்றலின் எனதுட லென்றலின்
ஐம்புல னொடுக்கம் அறிதலிற் கண்படில்
உண்டிவினை யின்மையின் உணர்த்த வுணர்தலின்
மாயா வியந்திர தனுவினுள் ஆன்மா"—
Third Sutra.

32. *Cf.* ......பெயர்சாதி குணமே கன்மம் பொருளென
வைந்துண்ட விகற்ப வுணர்வினுக்கு"
—Sivagnāna Siddhiyār, Alavai Iyal, 3.

33. For a fuller treatment of this subject refer to *Sivagnāna Pādiyam*, Fourth Sutra, First adhikaranam.

34. The term *ideation* is used by Sir John Woodroffe.

35. " ....அஞ்செழுத்தாய்
நின்றுன்று உளது அது நீ— "

[There is a consciousness in the form of *five letters* ; it is '*you.*']—Third Sūtra, First adhikarana—Vārttikam.

36. "மாயா தனுவிளக்கா மற்றுள்ளங் காணுதேல்.
ஆயாதா மொன்றை யதுவதுவாய்—வீயாத
வன்னிதனைத் தன்னுண் மறைத்தொன்றும்
தன்னைமலம் அன்றணைத ருன்" [காட்டம்போல்,
—Sivagnāna Bōdham, IV Sūtra, II adhikarana-Vārttikam

37. *Cf.* அத்துவிதம் என்ற சொல்லானே ஏகமெனில், ஏக மென்று சுட்டுவதுண்மையின் அத்துவிதமென்ற சொல்லே அந்நிய நாத்தியை யுணர்த்துமாயிட்டு"—Ibid—2nd Sūtra, 1st adhikarana—Vārttikam.

38. *Cf.* "ஒன்றென்ற தொன்றேகா ணென்றே
பதி ; பசுவாம்
ஒன்றென்ற நீ ; பாசத் தோடுளைகாண்."
—Ibid—2nd Sūtra, 1st adhikarana- Vārttikam.

39. In Tamil this state of mind is called 'இருவினை யொப்பு.'